

GENESIS

With Notes

JOHN BELLAMY

1818

Wipf and Stock Publishers
Bible Versions Reproduction Series: Volume #91
THE HOLY BIBLE—GENESIS
NEWLY TRANSLATED from THE ORIGINAL HEBREW

Translated by: JOHN BELLAMY

1818 Original Publisher LONGMAN, HURST, REES, ORME, AND BROWN;
AND BUDD AND CALKIN, LONDON, PATERNOSTER ROW & PALL-MALL
244 Pages

Copyright © 2000 by John S. Wipf, Jr. All rights reserved. Printed in the United States of America. Except as permitted under the United States Copyright Act of 1976, no part of this publication may be reproduced or distributed in any form or by any means, or stored in a data base retrieval system, without prior written permission of the publisher.

Wipf and Stock Publishers is pleased to present to you its digital reproduction of this book. By purchasing this book and receiving ownership of this copy, you expressly agree that you and any one to whom you transfer this book to is not entitled to reproduce or to allow anyone else to reproduce all or any portion of its contents without our prior consent.

If the purchaser does not agree to the foregoing terms of this sale, promptly return this copy for a refund of the purchase price. By retaining possession of this copy, you acknowledge that you agree to be bound by the foregoing terms. If you have any questions concerning this matter, please contact Wipf and Stock Publishers at the following address:

Wipf and Stock Publishers
1396 E. Washington Blvd.
Pasadena, CA, 91104
1-626-7 97-4756

Printer: James Baden
Binder: Golden Rule Bindery

ISBN: 1-57910-490-8

Bible Versions Reproduction Series

The purpose of the **Bible Versions Reproduction Series** is to make rare and out-of-print versions of the Bible readily and inexpensively available to scholars, Bible students, and Bible collectors. These reproductions are being offered especially to members of the International Society of Bible Collectors.

While still searching for hard-to-find original printings of Bible translations, many collectors have indicated what a delight it would be to have on their own shelves accurate reproductions of Bible versions currently available only in museums, libraries and private collections. Now such an opportunity is being offered by a collector who is himself a member of our Society.

It would be rare to imagine a more enthusiastic member of the ISBC than my long-time friend Jim Baden. Since joining the Society, he has amassed an extraordinary collection. Visiting his library could be a temptation to violate the tenth commandment were it not for his great generosity and eagerness to share what he has brought together.

It is essential, of course, that the reproduction process pose no threat to the integrity of the volumes being copied—no matter how fragile the precious originals may be. Such a method is now available, and Jim is demonstrating his confidence in the process by being the first to make some of his own prized volumes available.

Among the first publications in this Series is a reproduction of Isaac Leiser's 1904 *The Twenty-four Books of the Holy Scriptures*. Society members will especially enjoy knowing that the particular volume by Leiser was once the personal copy of Arnold Ehlert, the founder and first president of the ISBC. "A gift to A. D. Ehlert from Dr. H. A. Ironside, summer 1947" is handwritten on the flyleaf.

Jim Baden shares the reverence for Scripture that has moved the leaders of our Society to give so freely of their time and energy for the past thirty-five years. He has profound respect and gratitude for the heroes and heroines of Bible translation—from Wycliffe and Tyndale down to the present time—who worked so hard, even sometimes at the risk of life—to make the Bible so readily available to the world today. Like other members of the ISBC, Jim regards the Bible as more than just a great book to be collected. To use his own words, he speaks of the Scriptures as "God's method of communicating with his intelligent creatures . . . to be most carefully read and contemplated to discover its meaning and value for life in the present and future."

What is more helpful in discovering the meaning of Scripture than to have readily at hand a good collection of different versions? Some have even suggested they would rather have a variety of versions than commentaries! As the translators of the 1611 King James Version quote Saint Augustine in their memorable preface, “ ‘Variety of Translations is profitable for the finding out of the sense of the Scriptures.’ ” “Therefore blessed be they,” the preface continues, “and most honoured be their name, that break the ice, and giveth onset upon that which helpeth forward to the saving of souls. Now what can be more available thereto, than to deliver God’s book unto God’s people in a tongue which they understand?” And speaking of those who have labored to prepare translations other than the King James, the 1611 scholars urge “that we acknowledge them to have been raised up of God, for the building and furnishing of his Church, and that they deserve to be had of us and of posterity in everlasting remembrance.”

It is in this spirit and for this purpose that the **Bible Versions Reproduction Series** has been inaugurated.

William E. Paul, Editor, *Bible Versions and Editions*; Don Heese, Journal Production Manager; Sid Ohlhausen, Membership Secretary; Mark Mage, Editorial Assistant; Jim Baden and this writer have each supplied several hard-to-find versions for this reproduction. *

It is hoped that purchasers of volumes from this series will loan for copying other versions and editions that will become part of this reproduction Series. Those so doing will be rewarded with a free copy of a version of their choice from the Series.

Those interested are urged to contact the Publisher or Sidney Ohlhausen, Membership Secretary of the International Society of Bible Collectors, at: Box 20695, Houston, TX. 77225.

Graham Maxwell
(Charter Member #12)

*additional versions supplied by:
Bill Chamberlain

THE

HOLY BIBLE.

HOLY BIBLE,

NEWLY TRANSLATED

FROM

THE ORIGINAL HEBREW:

WITH

NOTES

CRITICAL AND EXPLANATORY.

BY JOHN BELLAMY,

AUTHOR OF "THE HISTORY OF ALL RELIGIONS."

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR THE TRANSLATOR.

PUBLISHED BY

LONGMAN, HURST, REES, ORME, AND BROWN, PATERNOSTER ROW;
AND BUDD AND CALKIN, Pall-mall.

1818.

TO

HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS

THE PRINCE REGENT.

SIR,

IMPRESSED with the sincerest gratitude, for the
condescension with which Your Royal Highness has been
pleased to regard my humble efforts in the cause of truth,

I have

I have the honour to avail myself of Your gracious permission to dedicate to Your Royal Highness, this NEW Translation of the HOLY BIBLE, from the original Hebrew, and have the honour to be, with the most profound respect,

SIR,

Your Royal Highness's

Most obliged and

Devoted Servant,

JOHN BELLAMY.

SUBSCRIBERS' NAMES.

THE REGENT, *Six Copies.*

THE QUEEN.

HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS THE DUKE OF YORK
 HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS THE DUKE OF KENT
 HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS THE DUKE OF CUMBERLAND
 HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS THE DUKE OF SUSSEX
 HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS THE DUKE OF CAMBRIDGE
 HER ROYAL HIGHNESS THE PRINCESS AUGUSTA SOPHIA
 HER ROYAL HIGHNESS THE PRINCESS ELIZABETH
 HER ROYAL HIGHNESS THE PRINCESS MARY
 HER ROYAL HIGHNESS THE PRINCESS SOPHIA.
 HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS THE DUKE OF GLOUCESTER,
 Chancellor of the University of Cambridge.

The Right Hon. Lord Greville, Chancellor of the University of Oxford
 The Right Hon. Earl of Hardwicke, High Steward of the University of Cambridge
 The Right Hon. the Earl of Aberdeen
 The Right Hon. the Earl of Caledon
 The Right Hon. the Earl of Dartmouth
 The Right Hon. the Earl of Darnley
 The Right Hon. the Earl of Egremont
 The Right Hon. the Earl of Fitzwilliam
 The Right Hon. the Earl of Harrington
 The Right Hon. the Earl of Morton
 The Right Hon. the Earl of Radnor
 The Right Hon. the Earl of Warwick
 The Right Hon. Lord Visc. Wentworth
 The Right Hon. Lord W. Bentinck
 The Right Hon. Lord Clinton
 The Right Hon. Lord Conyngham
 The Right Hon. Lord Grantley
 The Right Hon. Lord Hawke
 The Right Hon. Lord Northwick
 The Right Hon. Lord Rous
 The Right Hon. Lord Somerville
 The Right Hon. Lord Yarborough

The Rt. Rev. the Lord Bp. of Chichester
 The Rt. Rev. the Lord Bp. of Durham
 The Rt. Rev. the Lord Bp. of Exeter
 The Rt. Rev. the Lord Bp. of Norwich
 The Rt. Rev. the Lord Bp. of Salisbury
 The Rt. Rev. the Lord Bp. of Cloyne
 The Rt. Rev. the Lord Bp. of Derry
 The Rt. Hon. Lady Margaret Burges
 The Rt. Hon. Sir W. Drummond, Ten Copies
 The Rt. Hon. Sir. J. B. Warren, Bart.
 The Hon. R. Howard
 Sir T. D. Acland, Bart.
 Sir T. Baring, Bart.
 Sir Rowland Blennerhasset, Bart.
 Sir James Bland Burges, Bart.
 Sir Montague Cholmeley, Bart.
 Sir Leonard W. Holmes, Bart.
 Sir H. Ibbetson, Bart.
 Sir G. Staunton, Bart.
 Sir J. Saumarez, Bart.
 Sir J. Hamlyn Williams, Bart.
 Sir Robert Barclay, Bart.
 Gen. Sir B. Bloomfield, &c. &c.
 Major-General Farley

Colonel Beaufoy
 J. Dent, Esq. M.P.
 E. Berkeley Portman, Esq. M.P.
 B. Shaw, Esq. M.P.
 The Rev. Gerard Andrews, D.D. Dean of Canterbury
 The Rev. W. Bell, D.D. Prebendary of Westminster
 The Rev. S. Parr, D.D. Preb. of St. Paul's
 The Rev. F. Randolph, D.D. Preb. of Bristol
 The Rev. W. Douglas, Preb. of Westminster
 The Rev. M. Surtees, Preb. of Canterbury
 The Rev. J. W. Blomberg, Chaplain to H.R.H. the Prince Regent
 The Rev. J. Stanier Clarke, LL.D. Clerk of the Closet, Librarian, and Chaplain of the Household to H.R.H. the Prince Regent.
 The Rev. R. Valpy, D.D. Master of Reading School
 The Rev. — Vise, D.D.
 The Rev. T. Coke, LL.D.

The Rev. W. Mavor, LL.D.
 The Rev. J. Russell, M.A. Master of
 Charter House School
 The Rev. E. Valpy, B.D. Master of
 Norwich School
 The Rev. Joseph Alderson
 The Rev. W. Andrews
 The Rev. J. Bedford
 The Rev. T. Bewicke
 The Rev. J. Blazard
 The Rev. Mr. Brock
 The Rev. Mr. Chapman
 The Rev. J. J. Cleaver
 The Rev. G. Cumming
 The Rev. Lewis Evans
 The Rev. S. J. Gardiner, M.A.
 The Rev. J. Harton
 The Rev. John Jones, M.A.
 The Rev. E. J. Jones
 The Rev. J. Lewis
 The Rev. Henry Milner, LL.D.
 The Rev. R. Morrison
 The Rev. H. Pemble
 The Rev. W. Pritchard
 The Rev. J. Roberts
 The Rev. G. Savage
 The Rev. R. Simpson
 The Rev. Mr. Smernove
 The Rev. R. Smith
 The Rev. J. Spence, M.A.
 T. Stanley
 W. J. Totton
 G. Valpy, M.A.
 The Rev. D. G. Wait
 The Rev. C. Wapshare
 The Rev. J. Wooley
 G. Abbot, Esq.
 W. Abington, Esq.
 Isaac Aldebert, Esq.
 Capt. Andrews, R.N.
 Lieut. Arthur, R.N.
 Peter Auber, Esq.
 B. Ball, Esq.
 E. H. Barker, Esq.
 Dan. Beale, Esq.
 Capt. Beaufort, R.N. F.R.S.
 Public Library at Berne
 — Blegard, Esq.
 Geo. Bokenham, Esq.
 Edmund Boehm, Esq.
 J. Bowden, Esq.
 J. Brett, Esq.
 Lieut. Chas. Brome, R.N.
 B. Browne, Esq.
 Wm. Brathwaite, Esq.

R. Buchanan, Esq.
 Edw. Ruckeley, Esq.
 Mrs. A. M. Burges
 G. Burges, Esq. M.A.
 T. C. Cabell, Esq.
 Editor of CALMET
 C. Cartwright, Esq.
 Jos. Churchill, Esq.
 R. Clarke, Esq. Chamberlain of London
 Miss Frances Mary Curzer
 Editor of the CLASSICAL and BIBLICAL
 Journal
 T. Cockburn, Esq.
 W. Collet, Esq.
 Mr. Cove
 J. Dart, Esq.
 A. Davidson, Esq.
 J. Davis, Esq.
 W. Davis, Esq.
 C. Derrick, Esq.
 Mrs. Deverill, Nottingham
 R. Dickinson, Esq. Great Queen-street
 Mrs. Dixon
 Bryan Donkin, Esq.
 Mr. Richard Draper
 Mr. C. S. Dudley
 The Hon. G. Duff
 Major G. Duff
 W. Evans, Esq.
 T. Simpson Evans, LL.D.
 R. Ford, Esq.
 G. Frampton, Esq.
 R. Friend, Esq.
 W. Friend, Esq.
 Mrs. Kirkman Gardner
 F. Garrat, Esq.
 — Gartham, Jun. Esq.
 Capt. E. S. Graham, R.N.
 Mr. Grapel, 6 copies
 W. Gray, Esq. Glasgow
 I. F. Gwyn, Esq.
 T. Handley, Esq.
 Mr. Harding
 Mr. Harris
 Dr. Hawkins
 J. Henning, Esq.
 Jas. Horsburgh, Esq.
 Rd. Howard, Esq.
 J. Hume, Esq.
 James Hunter, Esq.
 Octavius Leeffe, Esq.
 J. Lemon, Esq.
 Miss Lintern
 Geo. Lister, Esq.
 T. G. Lloyd, Esq.

R. Lonsdale, Esq.
 H. Loree, Esq.
 H. Lowe, Esq.
 F. Magniac, Esq.
 — March, Esq. Greenwich, 2 copies.
 Capt. F. Mason, R.N.
 Samuel Maxey, Esq.
 J. Mayne, Esq.
 W. Meredith, Esq.
 Daniel Moore, Esq.
 J. Noble, Esq.
 Samuel Porter, Esq.
 Stephen Price, Esq.
 G. W. Ratcliff, Esq.
 J. Reeves, Esq.
 Mr. W. Robertson, Paisley
 E. Robson, Esq.
 G. Rose, Esq.
 T. Rowcroft, Esq. 2 copies
 T. Roworth, Esq.
 — Royley, Esq.
 D. H. Rucker, Esq.
 J. A. Rucker, Esq.
 H. J. Rucker, Esq.
 Capt. C. Rundal
 T. W. Rundal, Esq.
 H. Sanson, Esq.
 Rich. Saumarez, Esq.
 Frederic Silver, Esq.
 W. Simons, Esq.
 T. Smith, Esq.
 W. Smith, Esq.
 H. Somerville, Esq.
 Dr. Somerville
 H. Sower, Esq.
 Miss Staples
 — Stephens, Esq.
 Thos. Telford, Esq.
 Mrs. Thompson, Exeter
 Lieut. Col. Thompson
 G. A. Thompson, Esq.
 J. Thompson, Esq.
 A. Tilloch, Esq.
 W. H. Torrione, Esq.
 J. Urquhart, Esq.
 Capt. A. R. Valpy, R.N.
 Mr. A. J. Valpy, M.A.
 W. H. Valpy, Esq. Bengal
 F. Valpy, Esq.
 Col. Whithy
 — Willett, Esq. Howardin
 — Wigan, Esq.
 H. Woodthorpe, Esq. Jun.
 S. Young, Esq.
 Mr. Thos. Young

GENERAL PREFACE.

It is allowed by the learned in this and in every Christian nation, that the authorized translations of the Sacred Scriptures, in many places, are not consistent with the original Hebrew. A few extracts are here given from some of our most learned and distinguished writers, who were decidedly of opinion, that a New Translation of the Scriptures was absolutely necessary; not only on account of the great improvement in our language, but because the translators have erred respecting things most essential. The following are some of the eminent men who have left their testimony concerning the necessity of a New Translation :

“ Were a version of the Bible executed in a manner suitable to the magnitude of the undertaking, such a measure would have a direct tendency to establish the faith of thousands. . . . Let the Hebrew and Christian prophets appear in their proper garb : let us make them *holy garments* for glory and for beauty. . . . *The attempts of individuals should be promoted by the natural patrons of sacred learning.*” Bp. NEWCOMB.—“ Innumerable instances might be given of faulty translation of the divine original.”—“ An accurate translation, proved and supported by sacred criticism, would quash and silence most of the objections of pert and profane cavillers.” BLACKWALL’S *Sac. Class. Pref.* 1731.—“ Our last English version is undoubtedly capable of very great improvements.” WATERLAND’S *Script. Vindicated*, Part 3, p. 64.—“ Nothing would more effectually conduce to this end, than the exhibiting the Holy Scriptures themselves in a more advantageous and just light, by an accurate revival of our vulgar translation.” Dr. LOWTH’S *Visitat. Sermon, at Durham, 1758*.—“ The common version has many considerable faults, and very much needs another review.” *Biblioth. Lit.* p. 72, 1723.—“ The Old Testament has suffered much more than the New in our translation.” DODDRIDGE’S *Pref. to Family Expositor*.—“ Many of the inconsistencies, improprieties, and obscurities, are occasioned by the translators misunderstanding the true import of Hebrew words and phrases, shewing the benefit and expediency of a more correct and intelligible translation of the Bible.” PILKINGTON’S *Remarks*, 1759, p. 77.—“ The Version now in use in many places does not exhibit the sense of the text, and mistakes it, besides, in an infinite number of instances.” DURELL’S *Crit. on Job. 1772, Pref.*—“ That necessary work, a New Translation of the Holy Scriptures.” LOWTH’S *Prelim. Dissert. to Isaiah*, p. 69.—“ Whoever examines our version in present use, will find that it is ambiguous and incorrect, even in matters of the highest importance.” Prof. SYMONDS’S *Observations on the Expediency of revising the present Version*, 1799.—“ At this time, a New Translation is much wanted, and universally called for.” GURIN’S *Preface to Poetical Parts of the Old Testament*.—“ Great improvements might now be made, because the Hebrew and Greek languages have been much cultivated and far better understood, since the year 1600.” Dr. KENNICOTT’S *Remarks, &c.* 1787, p. 6.—“ The common Version has mistaken the true sense of the Hebrew in not a few places. Is it nothing to deprive the people of that edification which they might have received, had a fair and just exposition been substituted for a false one? Do we not know the advantages commonly taken by the enemies of Revelation, of triumphing in objections plausibly raised against the Divine Word, upon the basis of an unsound text or wrong translation?” BLANEY’S *Prelim. Disc. to Jeremiah*, 1789. “ They are not acquainted with the Hebrew, without which no man should pretend to be a critic upon the writings of the Old Testament. It has some peculiar properties and idioms which no other language has, with which every critic should be acquainted. . . . The Hebrew is fixed in nature, and cannot change. . . . He should be acquainted with the genius of the Hebrew tongue, and with it’s manner of expressing spiritual things, under their appointed images in nature.” ROMAINE’S *Works*, vol. v. p. xvi.—“ It is necessary that translations should be made from one time to another, accommodated to the present use of speaking or writing. This deference is paid to the heathen classics, and why should the scripture meet with less regard. PURVER.—“ The common English translation, though the best I have seen, is capable of being brought, in several places, nearer to the original.”—The Rev. J. WESLEY.

If we turn our attention to the Translations made in early ages of the Christian church, we approach no nearer to the truth; for as the common translations in the European languages were made from the modern Septuagint and the Vulgate, where errors are found in these early versions, they must necessarily be found in all the translations made from them.

REVISIONS.

Revisions of the Sacred Scriptures have been made by the orders of governments in different nations. In our own, the zeal for the truth was such, that the government of Elizabeth ordered a revision of the translation; and in the reign of James I. such were the defects, that another revision was thought necessary, which is the one now in public use. We know that great good has been done by such attention to the Scripture; but notwithstanding all that has been done, the translators have left it defective in *mood, tense, person, gender, infinitive, imperative, participles, conjunctions*, &c. and in many instances, almost in every page, we find verses consisting in a great part of italics, in some, a third part, and in others nearly half; as may be seen in Bibles where the words for which there is not any authority in the original, are always so marked. So that the meaning of the sacred writer is by these interpolations always obscured, and in many instances perverted.

The last revision was undertaken, in the year 1603, when fifty-four of the most learned in the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge were appointed, seven of whom died before the work was finished. These were divided into six companies; the names of the Revisors, and the proportion of the work allotted to each company, may be seen in Fuller's Church History, Book x. p. 44. But it appears that they confined themselves to the Septuagint and the Vulgate; so that this was only working in the harness of the first translators; no translation having then been made from the original Hebrew only, for 1400 years. Indeed it was well known that there was not a critical Hebrew scholar among them; the Hebrew language, so indispensably necessary for the accomplishment of this important work, having been most shamefully neglected, in our Universities; and, as at this day, all candidates for orders were admitted without a knowledge of this primary, this most essential branch of Biblical learning. It was, as it is at present, totally neglected in our schools, and a few lessons taken from a Jew in term time, whose business it is to Judaize, and not to Christianize, serve to give the character of Hebrew scholar.

Every elucidation of the text is truly valuable, and will be duly appreciated by the great majority of readers. And as the present translation is made from the Hebrew Scriptures *only*, the objectionable parts, which have had their origin from a mistaken and intemperate zeal for the purity of the Septuagint and the Vulgate translations, will be removed, by strictly adhering to the literal meaning of the Hebrew. So that this work will be useful to all Christians, but more particularly so for ministers of every denomination.

The Work now laid before the public is as literal a translation from the *pure Hebrew text only*, as the idiom of our language will in most cases admit of; independent of the opinions of any man, or set of men, however learned or respectable, of councils, synods, or decrees; or of any pre-conceived opinions of my own: for the literal meaning of the Hebrew—truth, and common sense; like the deluge, cover the mighty mountains, which bigotry, superstition, and false teaching, have raised to the skies.

A short account of the motives which first induced me to begin the gigantic labour of a new Translation from the original Hebrew, may be acceptable to the reader.

At an early period of my life I was taught to believe that the Bible was the word of God, that it contained a summary of all knowledge, necessary for our present and eternal happiness. As I advanced in years, and my understanding began to be capable of forming right conclusions, I was

struck with the grandeur and dignity of many parts of the common version. I rightly concluded, that if it were so excellent in the translation, what must it be in the original? and from that period a desire to obtain a knowledge of the sacred language, absorbed every other consideration. I therefore suffered nothing to put aside the accomplishment of this first great object. I have now devoted upwards of thirty years of my life to the study of the scriptures, and upwards of twenty to this work. At the beginning I only intended to obtain a knowledge of the Hebrew for my own satisfaction. This however was overruled, for when in a time of great national trouble, the enemies of the sacred record made use of the contradictory passages to aid them in overthrowing the Church as well as the State; whatever might be my opinion of their remarks concerning the contradictions in the common version, I thought it right to get a fair statement of the truth, as it stands in the original pure Hebrew text, laid before the public; to quiet the minds of the well meaning, by silencing such objections in future. I was diffident of my attainments, and therefore, after having waited for the answer of the late Bishop of Landaff (Watson) to the book entitled *The Age of Reason*; and finding that the prelate, in endeavouring to answer the objections, had given up the authority of the scriptures; (for if we were to admit that errors have been made by transcribers, away goes the authority at once) I then made an application to the Jewish lexicographer, David Levi, who engaged to refute the objections, provided I would assist him in the subscription. To this I readily agreed, and he soon (too soon to do any good) produced his work. But how was I astonished when I found that all he advanced, was quoted from the Bishop's book in another dress.

All hope seemed excluded, and I was left to chuse whether to attempt the thing myself, or suffer infidelity to triumph over the learning and ability of Christians and Jews. Presumptuous as it even appeared to myself at that period, now near twenty years since, I determined to make what opposition I could to the plausible objections of the infidels, which like serpents were creeping with their baneful poison into every corner of religious society; entertaining a hope that others would be stimulated to throw in their learning and ability, for the accomplishment of so desirable an object as that of supporting the credit of the Bible.

My first attempt was a humble one, which was to answer the objections put forth in the above mentioned publication only. But other objections being brought before me, the quantity of matter increased till the work, which at the beginning I intended to publish at half a guinea, would have amounted to two guineas. I now thought of going to press; but other important matter caused me greatly to enlarge the manuscript, that it would have made two large volumes, at a far higher price. I again concluded to go to press, and prepared accordingly; but this determination was put aside, and I was induced to begin the present Translation.

HEBREW WRITERS.

The Hebrew commentators are perhaps far more numerous, and their writings far more voluminous, than the Greeks, or Romans. To go no farther back than the time of Christ.

ONKELOS, wrote his commentary on the Law a few years before the Christian Æra.

JONATHAN, wrote on the Prophets, about the fiftieth year after Christ.

THE TARGUM OF JERUSALEM, is a Paraphrase on the five books of Moses, written in Chaldec.

PHILO JUDÆUS, on the Law, lived about the year 40.

JOSEPHUS, wrote on the ecclesiastical history of the Jews, in the first age of the Christian church.

THE MISHNAH, or Oral Law, is a Comment on the five books of Moses, by Rabbi Judah Hakkadosh, about the year 80.

THE TALMUDS of Jerusalem and Babylon, contain Comments on the Mishnah. The Jerusalem about A. D. 300—the Babylonish, about A. D. 500.

TARGUMS, or Paraphrases. See the London Polyglott, where they are published. The Chaldee Targums were written by Rabbi Joseph, about A. D. 400.

THE MAZOKETES were an order of Commentators among the Jews, who rose about the 450th year of the Christian Æra.

RABBI ABRAHAM BEN DAVID the Levite, was born about the year of Christ 766. He wrote a valuable Commentary on the Oral Law. And the חכמה התכונה *Chakmah hattekunah*, i. e. the science of astronomy.

RABBI ABRAHAM BEN MAAEER. Born A. D. 875. He was a great writer; an eminent grammarian, poet, physician, and astronomer.

RABBI SAADIAS GAON, about A. D. 930, wrote a Commentary on the book of Daniel.

RABBI ADDA BAR AHAVA, was born A. D. 1058. He was a most eminent astronomer: and laid down the most exact rules for the intercalations, so that the passover might take place, accurately on the month Abib, Deut. xvi. 1. But as their writers are exceedingly numerous, I must refer the reader to Levi, where in his *Lingua Sacra*, he has recorded a great many.

RABBI SOLOMON JARCHI, flourished in A. D. 1140. He wrote a very obscure commentary on the Bible.

ABEN EZRA. In 1160, wrote his Commentaries.

RABBI MOSES MAYMON, called Maimonides, a very eminent commentator, who wrote the *Moreh Nebochim*, or Teacher of the Perplexed, flourished about A. D. 1160.

RABBI DAVID KIMCHI, wrote Commentaries on a great part of the Old Testament. He flourished about A. D. 1220.

RABBI JACOB BAAL HATTURIM, wrote a Commentary on the five books of Moses about the year 1300.

RABBI LEVI BEN GERSHON, wrote Commentaries on the books of Moses, and other parts of Scripture, A. D. 1360.

RABBI ISAAC ABARBANEL, who lived about A. D. 1460, wrote some valuable Commentaries on the Scriptures.

OF THE ORIGINAL WRITERS OF THE BIBLE.

It has been supposed that Abraham possessed and brought away from Ur the books and records which his own country could produce. This appears to be just, for as the church regularly descend in the line of Seth to that Patriarch, there can be no doubt but that the records respecting the original writings, were brought away with him when God commanded him to quit Chaldea. These regularly passed to Isaac and Jacob, who became the supreme heads of the church, and so during the residence of the children of Israel in Egypt, they were preserved with all the additional circumstances and things, till the Exodus, when the levitical order of the priesthood was established at the end of the priesthood of Jacob, i. e. the priesthood of the first-born.

TRANSLATIONS OF THE HEBREW SCRIPTURES.

The first translation is that of the Greek, usually called, The SEVENTY, or the SEPTUAGINT. I refer the reader to what I have said on this translation.

The CHALDEE translations come next in order: they are not properly translations, but paraphrases.

The OLD SYRIAC translation was made within the first century of the Christian Æra.

The LATIN translations do not date before the introduction of Christianity into Rome.

ENGLISH TRANSLATORS OF THE BIBLE.

That the Saxons read the Bible in their own language, is generally supposed by critics; some parts having been translated by Adelm, Bishop of Sherborne; Eadfrid (or Ecbert) Bishop of Lindisferne; the Venerable Bede; and king Alfred. Ælfric, abbot of Malmesbury, translated the Pentateuch, Judges, and Job. These were printed at Oxford in the year 1699. Lewis's History of the English translation. The four gospels were printed from an ancient Saxon MS. now in the Bodleian Library, in 1571, under the care of the martyrologist John Fox, assisted and encouraged by Matthew Parker, archbishop of Canterbury. In the year 1349, the Psalms were translated by Richard Rolle, a hermit of Hampole in Yorkshire; and in the Harleian and King's libraries, are specimens of other early versions.

JOHN WICLIF translated the New Testament about the year 1377.

WILLIAM TYNDAL printed the first edition of his translation of the New Testament A.D. 1526.

MILES COVERDALE printed the first complete English Bible. The first edition bears date 1535, dedicated to king Henry VIII. ornamented with an emblematical border cut in wood, with the following words, "Biblia, the Bible; that is, the Holy Scripture of the Olde and New Testament; faithfully and newly translated out of Douche and Latyn into Englishe, M.D.XXXV."

THOMAS MATTHEWS printed a Bible; the first edition was in 1537. The title is in an emblematical frontispiece cut in wood. "The Byble, which is all the Holy Scripture; in which are contained, the Olde and New Testament, truly and purely translated into English by Thomas Matthews." This is partly from Tyndal, and partly from Coverdale's translation.

ARCHBISHOP CRANMER's Bible was printed in the year 1539. The Psalms are those now used in the liturgy. The other parts are a revision of the translations of Coverdale and Matthews' translations.

RICHARD TAVERNER printed a Bible. The title of Taverner's Bible is, "The Most Sacred Bible, which is the Holy Scripture, conteyning the Old and New Testament, translated into English, and newly recognised with great diligence after most faithful exemplars, by Richard Taverner, M.D.XXXIX."

ELIZABETH's Translation was printed in the year 1568. And the common Translation now in use was undertaken by order of king James the First, in the year 1609.

Calmet says, "The first division of the New Testament was made by Robert Stephens in 1551, and of the whole Bible in 1555." Michaelis says, "Verses were first used in the New Testament by Robert Stephens in 1551, and in the Old Testament by Hugo de St. Clacro, a Dominican monk, in the twelfth century." But a Latin Bible translated by Sanctus Pagninus, and printed at

Lyons in the year 1527, or 1528, before Robert Stephens had printed any Bible on his own account, is divided, the verses being numbered in the margin, and distinguished in the text by paragraphical marks, both in the Old and New Testament. See Calmet.

ON THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE HEBREW SCRIPTURES
AND THE SEPTUAGINT.

In every age of the Christian era, the most learned and pious men have seen with regret, the great disagreement which there is between the Chronology of the most ancient part of the Hebrew Scriptures, and the Septuagint; and between the ages of the patriarchs, as they stand in those ancient authorities.

In the early ages of the church, the parties in support of the Septuagint account seem to have had the better of the argument; but as the Hebrew language was very imperfectly understood at that period, the supporters of the most ancient authority, the Hebrew, were very few.

In the 16th century, this subject employed the pens of the most eminently learned men, among whom I. Vossius undertook to defend the chronology of the Septuagint. He was followed by the learned father Pezron; and in support of the Hebrew, I find the learned fathers Martiancy, and Le Quien.

"It might indeed have been expected," says the author of the Vindication of the Septuagint Chronology, "that writers of such extensive learning, and indefatigable application, might have been able to satisfy the world on which side of the question the truth, or at least the greatest probability, lies; and by that means have put an end to the dispute. But this we see has not been the case; for to this day the world is divided on this point."

I shall not enter into the different views of the writers on this subject, for as no satisfactory information has ever been given from the earliest ages of the Christian church, that in any way accounts for this great discrepancy, it would answer no good end, and would only be intruding on the time of the reader.

The first thing which arrested my attention was, that the ages of the patriarchs down to the flood differ in *exact hundreds*; the ages of the patriarchs in the Septuagint being *one hundred* years more than they are recorded to be in the *Hebrew Scriptures*; making the chronology to the flood exactly *six hundred* years more in the Septuagint than it is in the Hebrew; the Septuagint amounting to 2256 years, the Hebrew to 1656.

It certainly appears to be a difficult subject to elucidate: I have repeatedly taken it up, and have laid it down, like many others in different ages, without gaining any light; but as it has always appeared to be a desirable thing to come to some conclusion concerning it, because objectors have brought it forward to shew (as they term it) the disordered state of the Bible; I have not ceased in my endeavours to solve this problem of ages. I trust my efforts have not been altogether useless, and that the following remarks will satisfy the critic and the learned chronologer, that the Hebrew and the Septuagint *perfectly agree with each other*.

In order that the reader may fully comprehend the subject of our inquiry, I shall give a table of the chronology of this age of the world, agreeably to the Hebrew, the Septuagint, and Josephus; I shall then refer to the Hebrew reading, and shew that the difference has partly been occasioned by improper translation, and by Josephus fixing the ages of the patriarchs *one hundred* years at a

more advanced period of their lives than ought to have been; and that the Hebrew, the Septuagint, and Josephus, fully agree, both as to the chronology of the world, and the ages of the patriarchs.

Thus it is said in the Septuagint, Josephus, and the Hebrew, that,

Septuagint.	Years.	Josephus.	Hebrew.
Adam lived	230	230	130
Seth	205	205	105
Enos	190	190	90
Cainan	170	170	70
Mahaleel	165	165	65
Jared	162	162	62
Enoch	165	165	65

The reader will see that this table exhibits the ages of the patriarchs at the birth of their sons, agreeably to the Hebrew, the Septuagint, and Josephus; and we find that the Septuagint and Josephus differ from the Hebrew exactly *one hundred* years in the age of each patriarch. It will also be seen that in this table, the Septuagint is a copy of the statement in Josephus. I say, a copy, for it is proper to observe, that the translation called the Septuagint, is not the ancient Septuagint which was translated in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus before Christ, which has been proved by the learned Bishop Usher, and other learned men; but which was compiled in the early ages of the church, at the beginning of the second century. And as Josephus wrote his history after the destruction of Jerusalem, near *one hundred* years before this translation was made, the Greek translators must have copied the chronology from Josephus.

But the most convincing proof that the present Septuagint is not the ancient Septuagint, translated, as above, before Christ, and which has escaped the notice of all the learned men who have written on this subject, is, that the nouns, which in Hebrew are in regimine or construction, and which are always in the genitive case, are by the Greek translators of this modern Septuagint, put in the nominative case. Now as it must be allowed that the translators of the ancient Septuagint must have understood grammatically both the Hebrew and the Greek, and as the Hebrew at the dispersion of the Jews, was not understood by Christians, being in the hands of Jews only; it proves that the present Septuagint must have been made in the early ages of the Christian Church, in the time of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotian.

There is one thing however in which all these authorities agree; in the Hebrew, the Septuagint, and Josephus, the length of the life of each patriarch is the same. This led me to conclude, that as the time they lived is the same in the Septuagint, and in Josephus, as it is in the Hebrew, that the difference must have arisen either by a wrong translation of the passages, or by Josephus having placed the *hundred* years of the generation of Abel to each at a more advanced age of the world; I proceed therefore to examine the original Hebrew.

The first verse in the common version begins thus, *This is the book of the generations of Adam; in the day that God created man.* There are two states described in the 1st, 2nd, and 3d verses of this chapter, for the intelligent reader will see that from the creation to the birth of Seth was *one hundred and thirty* years, during which period the generation of Abel, by which is understood in Scripture *one hundred* years, had passed away. The word בְּיוֹם *beyom*, rendered, *in the day*, is not to be confined to the day in which he was created, for if so, as he was created on the sixth,

he must have fallen on the seventh day. It means, a *time, season*, Gen. xxxix. 11; Isa. xxx. 8, *continually*; Gen. vi. 5; Psa. xlv. 15; and with the \beth prefixed, calls for the same rendering as in Judges xx. 15, *at that time*. This gives the true application of the word, and which then makes a distinction between the two states introduced by the sacred writer. The first is confined to the *time, or season*, when man enjoyed a state of perfection in Paradise, viz. while he kept in that state which is mentioned in this verse, *In the likeness of God made he him*. For did this not refer to the *time* during which he remained in Paradise, *in the likeness of God*, the sacred historian would certainly not have used these words, as he had already declared *the same*, in the *same words*, ch. i. 26, 27. It cannot be allowed that the inspired writer would repeat the same words without a reference to something else, as he is made to do in this verse of the common version; such repetitions are not to be met with in the original, they would be condemnable in the productions of men. Therefore he here evidently refers to the *time, or season*, when man remained *in the likeness of God*, during which *time* he continued in the state of perfection in which he was created.

It has been supposed to the present day, that Adam and Eve were the only persons in Paradise, but if a little attention be given to the subject, we shall find that such a supposition cannot be allowed; for the moment they were created, the divine command was, *Be fruitful and multiply*. It also should have been recollected that the term *Adam*, is a general term for MAN, and called their name *Adam* (man.) And though they are only mentioned, it is no proof that a solitary man and woman were the only human beings at this period of the world—for *one hundred and thirty years* after the creation we read only of an addition of two, viz. Cain and Abel; but we cannot conclude that 130 years had elapsed, and that two persons were all who were then born.

The second state introduced here *in the book of the generations of Adam*, is by the line of Seth, who after the generation of Abel, on the defection of Cain, became the legal successor. It is to these two states that Josephus, and after him the modern Septuagint, refer, in making Adam and his successors, exactly *one hundred years* older than the Hebrew at the birth of their sons. For as *one hundred and thirty years* are only mentioned in the Hebrew, as the age of Adam at the birth of Seth, Josephus and the Septuagint have concluded, that the time of Abel *was one generation*; and as a generation in scripture means *one hundred years*, it appears that this *one hundred years, or generation of Abel*, has been by them added to the 130 years of Adam, and thus have concluded that he was 230 years old at the birth of Seth. This appears to have been the original cause of the difference between the Hebrew, Josephus, and the Septuagint.

The fourth verse is improperly divided in the first proposition. *Rebia*, after אָדָם *Adam*, and *Katon* after *Seth*, as the forerunner of *Atnah*, where the first proposition ends, show that the true division is as in the new translation. So that אַחֲרָיו *akearce*, rendered *after*, is not here applied to the birth of Seth, but to the descendants, or line of Seth. Evidently meaning that these eight hundred years took their beginning at the death of Abel, in the hundred and thirtieth year of Adam.

INTRODUCTION.

IT is not necessary to say much on the great importance of the Hebrew Scriptures; we receive them as the word of God, and therefore we must expect to find them worthy of their Divine Author, unimpeachable as they have respect to moral justice, powerful as truth, and consistent with enlightened reason, good sense, and conclusive argument. Thus they call for our most profound veneration, and serious attention to their contents. They are the evidence for the truth of the New Testament, by shewing the accomplishment of prophecy, for to these very Hebrew Scriptures Christ appealed, when he said to the Jews, *Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they that testify of me;—and beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself.* To these very Hebrew Scriptures then we are commanded to appeal; this is the imperious duty of all Christians, and in conformity with this command I have endeavoured to lay a literal translation of them before the public.

As it is consistent with the nature of this introduction, so it may be agreeable to the reader to be informed how the original language descended to the time of the dispersion of the Jews.

The Hebrew Bible is called ספר קודש *Sepher Kodesh*, the book of holiness, or the holy book. The reason for this title is obvious; the language was given by God himself to the first of men, and therefore justly called the sacred language. Adam and his posterity, down to the time of the Babel confusion, spoke this language. From this period it is believed that other languages began to be formed; but nevertheless we find that the Hebrew language remained pure, and descended pure by the line of Shem, through all the Patriarchal churches to the time of Abraham and Moses. In the same pure order it descended to the time of the Captivity; and though their vernacular tongue had gotten a little of the Babylonish pronunciation, which in truth was their original language, and which differed only as to some of its terminations, yet they retained the pure Hebrew Scriptures, ספר ישר the *Sepher Jasher*, i.e. the book of the upright.

Some have supposed that the original, even at this period, had been adulterated; but such persons should have recollected that before the captivity, every copy sent forth for the use of the synagogues, and every copy sent forth for the use of the people, was written by the Scribes, so called from the performance of this very duty; and they were not sent forth till they had been accurately read over, and corrected, word for word, letter for letter, vowel for vowel, and accent for accent, and compared by the whole body of these learned men in full assembly, with the original temple copy or book of Jasher; these copies, found in every family, were taken with them to Babylon, so that there was not a possibility for any error, had such appeared in one or more copies, to have been handed down to posterity.

In this order the language descended to the time of Christ, at which period we find, that the Hebrew Scriptures were perfect; for though he told them, *they transgressed the commandment of God by their traditions*, he never charged them with having corrupted the text, or with having taken away one *iota*, or one *tittle*, from any part of the word of God; which he most certainly

would have done had this been the case. And it will be shewn in its proper place, that the quotations made by him and the Apostles from the Old Testament, were not quoted from the Septuagint, as has been too hastily supposed, but *word for word*, and *vowel for vowel*; as they now stand in the Hebrew. This is sufficient authority for Christians to rest assured, that to the *time of Christ*, and *the Apostles*, the *Hebrew Scriptures were as pure as when first written*.

After the dispersion of the Jews, the sacred language was still preserved pure: they had these Scribes even as late as the third century of the Christian era, (see Rabbi Abarhanal,) and supplied their brethren, as well as the Christians in different nations, with copies prepared agreeably to their ancient custom. About two hundred years after Christ, when the Hebrew was only in the hands of Jews, and Christians could not refer to these ancient oracles but through the medium of the Septuagint, Porphyry and Celsus, the inveterate enemies of the Christian cause, began to oppose the truths of the scriptures. And notwithstanding the great increase of the converts to christianity, the spirit of infidelity manifested itself in the first three centuries after Christ; and Deists, who were guided by the version of the Septuagint, in which there are translations altogether inconsistent with the original Hebrew, became too formidable in argument to be silenced by quotations from the Greek. In this state the Hebrew language remained secluded from Christians to the time of Jerome.

Thus we find that the Hebrew language was almost a dead language among Christians, to the time of Symmachus, who made the first Christian translation into Greek. In the fourth century, Jerome attempted to mend the old Latin translation by the Hebrew and Greek; but we find he retained most of the errors of the first translations: this is called the Vulgate, which is still in use, and from it and the Greek, all the European translations have been made.

Pagninus was sensible that Jerome had committed many errors, and in A. D. 1528, full twenty years before a copy of the Hebrew Bible was printed, attempted to rectify them; but many of his corrections are not sanctioned by the original. Some of them however approach nearer to the truth. But indeed Christians at this period knew very little of Hebrew.

Among all the attempts which have been made since the time of Aquila, A. D. 128, to give a translation of the Scriptures, I do not find that the translators in any one instance, have confined themselves to the Hebrew *only*; they have universally translated from translations; which, though they were said by some, who were evidently not critically acquainted with Hebrew, to be excellent, are now allowed by the learned to be very defective, and in numbers of instances no better than comments, which are as opposite to the sense of the original text as error is to truth. Thus revisions after revisions have been made in all Christian nations, by having recourse to the early translations, the Septuagint, and the Vulgate; different readings have appeared, and errors have been multiplied on errors, as the translators have differed respecting the identical meaning of a Greek or Latin word: so that in the Polyglot of Walton, who thought he was doing a great work to perpetuate the Scriptures in various languages, every version will be found, even on very important subjects, to contradict each other.

A literal translation from the original Hebrew, therefore, not having been attempted for so very long a period, encouraged me to hope that something might be done for the honour of the Bible, by removing those stumbling-blocks which have strengthened the arguments of Infidels.

THE ITALIC OF OUR BIBLES.

In the best editions of the authorized English version, the reader will find a vast number of words in *Italics*, in the body of the text; which are so printed to shew that there is not any authority for them in the original Hebrew. These have been put in by the translators, to make sense of the text, and as they thought, to render intelligible the idioms of the Hebrew and Greek, in the English language. For the most part they are lamentable corruptions, which pervert the sense of the original, make the sacred writer say what he never did say, and which, in things the most important, charge God with commands he never gave—with destruction, adult and infant destruction, shocking to the feelings of humanity; but which, for the eternal honour of the Scripture, were never executed. Had the Hebrew been critically understood by the translators, so as to have translated from it only, there had been no necessity for many of these additions to the text.

PUNCTUATION.

I have paid particular attention to the punctuation. In the common version we frequently find it so neglected, that the first proposition is made to run into the second, and the second into the third; by which the true sense is not known. I have therefore closely adhered to the Hebrew punctuation; which will be found to add great light to numbers of passages hitherto so obscure, that Bishop Lowth says on Isaiah lxiv. 5, "I am at a loss how to understand this passage;"—and Dr. Taylor, on Jer. xxxi. 22, "I am not able to determine."

Punctuation is designed to point out the various parts of a sentence; such as the major, and the minor propositions, and the branches of those propositions; which when understood, give the requisite time for the rest of the voice. They are essentially useful to obtain the true sense of the speaker, or writer; for let but the propositions be marked wrong, and the sense is either obscure, or perverted. So arbitrary and capricious is our punctuation, that if any number of men, abiding by the present random methods, were to take a chapter unpointed, they would all differ from each other: some would use the comma instead of the semi-colon; and others the semi-colon instead of the colon, or period.

Points are essentially useful for all readers of the Scriptures, but particularly for such as have not studied the nature of the propositions, and therefore are not able to distinguish them in the undivided sentence, in order to give the proper rest. This was the custom among the ancient Hebrews; so that in all accurate Hebrew Bibles, the propositions, major and minor, with their branches, agreeably to the intention of the sacred writer, are all marked with their proper character. Therefore those who may be disposed to condemn what they do not understand, will do well first, to acquaint themselves with the nature of propositions, and to point them out. They will then be qualified, and not till then, to form a right judgment. I have nothing to say to those, who may think proper to object, because the punctuation is not the same as in the vulgar version.

Some injudicious writers have said, that "the system of punctuation was probably invented by the Mazorites—that it is a continual gloss on the Law and Prophets—that their *vowel points*, and prosaic and metrical *accents*, give every word to which they are affixed, a peculiar meaning, which in their simple state, multitudes of them can by no means bear—and that the vowel points add

whole conjugations to the language." It is however a mistake of such writers, that the "vowels add whole conjugations to the language." The conjugations, Hiphil and Hithpaël, are signified by their prefixes and terminations; the preter of Niphal by prefix, Piel differs only from Kal, by its vowels, for it cannot be called a different conjugation; as to *visit* in Kal, and to *visit diligently* in Piel, embrace the same meaning. With regard to the passives, it cannot be said that they are different conjugations.

CHRIST QUOTED FROM THE HEBREW.

I may be told, that Christ and the Apostles quoted the Scriptures from the Septuagint; for this has often been asserted, even by some of the learned. But it is a serious mistake: they always made their quotations from the Hebrew Scriptures. Where the Septuagint agree with the original, it may be said that Christ and the Apostles agree with the Septuagint; but where the Septuagint are at variance with the Hebrew, and the quotation is consistent with the Hebrew, then it must be admitted that the Hebrew was always quoted by Christ and the Apostles. A few examples will prove this.

John, ch. ii. 17, *ζηλος τοῦ οἴκου σου κατέφαγέ με* is a quotation from Psalm lxix. 10, כִּי קִנְיַת בֵּיתְךָ כִּי קִנְיַת *ki kinath beethka akaalaathni, for the zeal of thine house hath eaten me up.*

But the latter clause of this first verse of the Psalm in the Septuagint, is not only inconsistent with the Hebrew, but with the whole tenor of the Christian religion. The English translation, though not accurate, is not chargeable with any thing of this nature. It stands thus in Hebrew, רָחֹק מִשְׁעוּתִי דְּבָרִי שָׁמָּה *raachok mishougthi dibree shaanaathi*, which the English translators have rendered thus, *Why art thou so far from helping me, and from the words of my roaring?* But the Septuagint, μακρὰν ἀπὸ τῆς σωτηρίας μου οἱ λόγοι τῶν παρακτωμάτων μου *The words of my transgressions are far from my salvation.* From this it appears evident, that the English translation agrees in sense with the Hebrew, and that the Septuagint translation is altogether inconsistent with both. The Greek translation cannot be applied to Christ, as intimated; for it is said of him, that *he was without sin*: 2 Cor. v. 21; 1 Pet. ii. 22.

Luke xxiii. 46, from Psalm xxxi. 5, בְּיָדְךָ מֶשְׁכַּב רֹחִי *beyaadka aphkid rouchi, Into thy hand I commend my spirit.* Ch. xx. 17, from Psalm cxviii. 22, אֶבֶן מַאֲסוֹ הָבִינִים הָיְתָה לְרֹאשׁ פִּנָּה *Eben maaeasou habbonim haathak lerosh pinah, The stone which the builders refused is become the head of the corner.* In these passages the Septuagint agree with the Hebrew; therefore we have authority to say, that so far, they are quoted from the Hebrew.

In the following passage we find that the quotation is made from the Hebrew verbatim, and not from the Septuagint: Matt. xxvii. 46, 'Ηλὶ, 'Ηλὶ, λαμὰ σαβαχθάνι—Psalm xxii. 1, אֵלִי אֵלִי לָמָּה עֲזַבְתָּנִי *Eli Eli laama gnazabthani, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?* But the Septuagint, Ὁ ΘΕὸς, ὁ Θεός μου, προσχέες μοι, ὡστί ἐγκατέλιπές με—*O God, O my God, attend to me, why hast thou forsaken me?*

Thus the Apostles and Christ himself declare, that the passage in the above Psalm was spoken of him. But the Jewish translators have supposed, that it was spoken by David concerning himself. These are convincing proofs that Christ and the Apostles made their quotations from the original Hebrew, and not from the Greek: from the pure Hebrew, and not from the Septuagint, a corrupt translation.

INTEGRITY OF THE HEBREW TEXT.

From these undeniable proofs of the purity of the Hebrew text, and of the conformity of the quotations in the New Testament thereto; I hope that no one who means to write in support of the Bible, will ever attempt to support the arguments of objectors, by opposing THE ABSOLUTE INTEGRITY OF THE HEBREW TEXT. For, from what has been said, it is evident that it is as pure as it was in the time of David, and that the words of Christ have been hitherto verified, where he says, *that not one IOTA or one TITTLE shall pass from the law until all be fulfilled.*

Now it must be allowed, that by the Greek and Latin translations, no one can possibly silence the arguments which objectors have advanced against the *common translations* of the Bible, because these are the Greek and Latin speaking in the European translations. Consequently it will appear evident, that a critical knowledge of the Hebrew language is as desirable for those who are designed for the ministry, as the Greek; nay, it is absolutely necessary, for without it the Greek will not enable them to answer the objections of such as sedulously introduce to public notice, the errors and contradictions arising from the mistranslations only.

We have often been told of the alarming growth of Deism; but we need not wonder at the progress it has made for the last twenty years, when the leaders of a great nation, calling themselves *philosophers*, have holdly declared, on the ground of all the translations, ancient and modern, that DEATH IS AN ETERNAL SLEEP. See on Gen. iii. 22. Therefore, so long as such objectionable passages, as have been advanced by this description of ingenious men, but which are not consistent with the Hebrew, are permitted to disgrace the pages of the sacred volume, if men were to preach with the language of angels, with such men, arguments, however reasonable for the defence of the Scriptures, cannot possibly produce any ultimate good.

To shew the fallacy of the assertions as to Hebrew points, &c. let any person try the experiment. Is any language written without punctuation? Can ideas be correctly communicated without attending to this necessary mode of indication? And as to the "vowel points, and prosaic and metrical accents, giving every word to which they are affixed a peculiar meaning, which, in their simple state, multitudes of them can by no means bear;" any person may try even in his own language, whether there be any truth in such a remark. For example, write the consonants *h r*: How is the reader to know whether it means *hare, hire, heir, hair, hour, or hoar*? Or write the letters *p r*: How is the reader to know whether it means *pair, pare, pier, pore, poor, or pure*? and so of others. A language of this description would indeed be a nondescript, altogether vague and uncertain, and capable of being applied to different meanings and acceptations. This is the opinion of those who pretend to understand the Hebrew language without vowels.

Some again will pretend to read Hebrew with what they call the *matres lectiones*; that is, they have supposed the vowels to be chosen after the manner of the western languages, viz. that certain letters, which indeed are but consonants, are to express, or enable the reader to express, each word. But these letters do not occur in succession in any word throughout the Bible. Consequently such pretensions to a knowledge of Hebrew must be all guess-work; there would be no certainty in the language, which is the most correct of all others, if every word had not its precise and determinate meaning, as is the case in all languages. Every word would have as many different meanings in Hebrew, as above, in the examples I have given of *h r*, and *p r*. And then

the word of God would be altogether uncertain, and incapable of application. The word דבר *dobeer*, having the same consonants as *dabbeer*, דבר *daabaar*, דבר *debar*, דבר *dibber*, and דבר *deber*; no person could possibly tell whether it meant *saith*, *speaks*, *thing*, *word*, *spoke*, or *pestilence*. No human sagacity could possibly distinguish the *dual* from the *plural*, if the language were not written with the vowels; for the consonants are the same in both.

Again: the *radical form* of the verb is the same in *kal*, *piel*, *phual*, imperative, infinitive, and participle, benoni, or active, viz. פָּקַד *paakad*, *he visited*. But if the vowels were to be rejected, there would be no certainty in the application; in the first conjugation, *kal*, *he visited*, would be mistaken for *visit thou*, *visiting*, *visited*, *hath been visited*, *visited often*, *visit often*; not to notice the impossibility of pronouncing the letters *pkd* without vowels, or by putting in vowels at random, which, as I have shewn, necessarily vary the application in the English language, as well as the Hebrew.

Before, as well as after the captivity, all the copies circulated throughout their nation were written with the vowels, as was the case with all languages, Ezra, ch. viii. 8, *So they read in the book in the law of God distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the meaning*. But it was not possible to give the sense and cause them to understand the meaning without the vowels. If a language be written without vowels, the naked consonants alone are dead in themselves, and cannot be pronounced. There is no possibility of pronouncing such words as these without vowels: דבר *dbr*, דבר *hbr*, בלל *bill*, כל *kl*, רחב *rhb*, ברכ *brk*, צלם *tslm*, צמד *tsmd*, פקד *pkd*. Surely there needs no argument to prove the absurdity of putting in vowels at random, as there then would be no certainty in the application of any word in the language.

Some who do not comprehend the nature and use of the *vowels*, entertain a notion that they were invented in the time of Ezra, and so written that they might understand the sense. This concession goes farther than such reasoners are aware of; for if these vowels were written to give the sense, then it would follow that these selfsame words of Scripture, written before the captivity without the vowels, must necessarily have had the selfsame sense before the time of Ezra; and as no Hebrew word ever could be spoken without vowels, it will also necessarily follow, that though they wrote them without vowels, yet these same vowels were *understood* and *pronounced*, in order to give articulation to the consonants, which could not possibly have been spoken without them. Therefore to allow that they were written by the men of the great synagogue in the time of Ezra, at the return from the captivity, is to allow that they were so well known before the captivity, that they could pronounce them without their being written; which indeed is the practice at this day in every synagogue. They read the Scriptures without the vowels, but always attentively read the lesson for the day, the day before, or in the morning before the service, in a copy with the vowels.

The learned Jews, however, before and after the coming of Christ, were of a different opinion. The Jerusalem Talmud was written about the year of Christ 200, Rabbi Jochanan president; and the Babylonish, before the year 500. Both these Talmuds quote the Mazorites, (Hieros. Megilla, c. 4; Nodarim, c. 4. 37; Kedduschim, c. 1. 30.) Thus it is evident that a reference is made to the first Mazorites, or men of the great Synagogue, over whom Ezra presided. What little information then must those writers have acquired concerning the origin of the vowels, who have contended that they were not known before the fifth, and some not till the tenth century!

Moses says, Deut. xxvii. 8, *And thou shalt write upon the stones all the words of this law plainly.* But if the vowels be not attended to, it would not be possible to understand the law. For example, שְׁמוֹ *shemo*, his name; but the same consonants with a change of the vowel make שֹׁמוֹ *shommou*, astonished. Jer. ii. 12, קֹדֶשׁ *Kodesh*, holy; but by a variation of the vowels the same consonants signify *unclean*, see Deut. xxiii. 17. כְּבוֹד *Kabeed*, means *honour*, Gen. xx. 12; but the same consonants by a change of vowel, mean '*grievous*,' Gen. xx. 10; '*slow*,' Exod. iv. 10; '*laden*,' Isa. i. 4; '*heavy*,' Exod. xvii. 12; '*glory*,' Nah. ii. 9. בָּרַךְ *Barceke*, *bless*, Deut. xxiii. 11; בֵּרֶךְ *bereke*, the *knee*, Isa. xlv. 32; בִּשְׂרָר *bisar*, *tidings*, Jer. xx. 15; the same consonants with a change of vowel, mean *flesh*; Gen. ii. 21, &c. And so in all the scripture, as I have shewn, is the same with words in English, and as is customary in all languages. Hence it will appear, that those commentators who say that the Hebrew language is uncertain, because the same word has several meanings, have but acquired a smattering of the sacred language. I have the production of one of these commentators before me, who, writing concerning the נָחָשׁ *Naachash*, i. e. the *serpent*, Gen. ch. iii. 1, and questioning the certainty of words in Hebrew, is at a loss to know the cause of the variety of meanings given to this word in the scripture, as we find it means, "*a snake, a hippopotamus, fornication, a chain, a pair of fetters, a piece of brass, a piece of steel, and a conjurer.*" Did this uncertainty appear, it would annihilate the faith of both Jew and Christian in the divine record; as the Hebrew, which with its proper vowels is the most certain language in the world, would become the most uncertain, and the divine laws would be capable of various meanings and applications. The reader will see that writers cannot be depended on, who are so lamentably deficient in the first and most necessary branch of Hebrew learning, without which no man should presume to turn commentator.

IMPROPER TRANSLATIONS OF HEBREW CONJUNCTIONS.

Serious errors have been made also by the improper translation of the ו *vau*, which has been almost universally translated as a conjunction copulative *and*. This error was made by the first translators; for allowing that they understood the different applications of the ו *vau*, which, according to construction, answers to various conjunctions in other languages, it evidently appears that as Jews, they were not critically acquainted with the conjunctions to which the ו *vau* corresponded in other languages, so as to choose the proper conjunction; and the Gentile translators were not critically acquainted with the Hebrew, so as to enable them to translate the ו *vau* agreeably to its various acceptations, as understood by the ancient Hebrews. This has been farther confirmed by inattention to the uses and applications of the ו *vau* by the Septuagint. And for this reason it is, that we so frequently find the ו *vau* in the authorized English version, translated by the conjunction copulative *and*, in many verses six and seven times, when in reality it often ought to be so written not more than *once*. In the first chapter of Genesis, the number exceeds *ninety*, a redundancy highly improper, when the ו *vau* does not call for a conjunction copulative in more than ten or eleven places. From which it will be seen, that the error has been first committed by the Latin translators, who have constantly translated ו *vau*, and וְ *va*, by *et*; and the more modern translators, who followed the Latin version principally, by the continual repetition of the conjunction copulative *and*. These errors arising from the improper translation of the ו *vau*, will be shewn in the notes. For as וְ *va*, was taken by the Greeks from the Hebrew ו *vau*, and *et* by the La-

tins, they necessarily must have the same power, and are as capable of the same variation as the *vau*; answering according to rule, to *and, when, thou, yea, but, even, moreover, likewise, also, when, for, which, who, with, now, because, as, thus, before, even, that, nor, moreover, therefore, nevertheless, whence, whose, though, till, afterwards, again, except, &c.*

But this is the case with other conjunctions, which will be noticed in their respective places, and which in the authorized version, not only give a direct denial to a positive assertion in the same verse; but in numbers of instances make the passage inconsistent with truth, and with the common acceptation of words in all the European languages.

No word will be found in the new translation which is not literally found, or which is not comprehended in the original Hebrew. Those words also which are added by the translators, but for which there is not any authority, are omitted; for by attending particularly to the conjunctions, that is, by noticing every conjunction in the original, and by giving its corresponding conjunction in the translation, agreeably to the rule of the language, which is always conformable to the sense of the narrative; the force of the Hebrew will become evident. Whereas additions to the text, as we find them so very frequently in the royal translation, only have a tendency to obscure the passage, and in a great many instances, not merely render it altogether unintelligible; but, what is more serious, where a sense is given, it often proves to be altogether foreign to the intention of the inspired writer, as appears in the course of the chapter.

In many places the reader will find that the translators have mistaken the persons and tenses of verbs; consequently a sense has been given inconsistent with the intention of the sacred writer.

KERI AND CHETIB.

Serious errors have also been made by those translators who have translated according to *Keri*, and others, who have translated according to *Chetib*. It may be necessary to explain these terms. The *Keri* translators endeavour to give the sense of the text, and frequently omit some important word, or attempt to alter the original. But by *Chetib* is meant the true text, which should be translated so as not to reject a single word in the original. Hitherto the *Keri* and *Chetib* translators stand opposed to each other, and have been so understood even by Jews themselves, ever since the dispersion of that people.

Thus the method of the *Keri* translators, when they could not translate every word without making the passage inconsistent, was by expunging certain words, which, taken according to the order of European syntax, would make the scripture plainly contradict itself.

Chetib means the *literal text*, which among the ancient Hebrews was well understood, for no one can suppose that the sacred word was given by God in a language in which superfluous words were used; from which it must appear evident to all, that the *Chetib*, or a translation where every word of the original text is given, is the conscientious duty of every one who attempts to translate the word of God. Otherwise it is at the peril of his own soul, *if he either adds or takes away* from the words of the ספר קודש *sepher kodesh*, HOLY BOOK. This, I am sorry to say, is done in the European translations, of which abundant proof will be given, where, on this account, such passages are in plain contradiction, not only to each other, but the latter part of the same verse is made to contradict the former part.

I have therefore endeavoured to reconcile the *KERI* translators, or those who have attempted

to give the sense of the passage, by rejecting a word or words, with **CHETIB**; or those who have adhered to the whole of the original text, who must have given the true sense when they strictly abided by the very letter; and these were the ancient Hebrews. Had the Keri translators understood the *accentual reading*, there had been no necessity for them to have rejected any part of the sacred text; there would have been no necessity, as has been asserted by the later Mazorites, for **לֹל lo**, i. e. **NOT**, to be read as **לֹל lov**, to him; and so for other words.

The learned Buxtorf says, that this important branch of Hebrew learning has been altogether neglected, both by Jews and Christians, if not lost. He observes, "the vowel-points and accents are called **מגות magnam**, i. e. *judgment, reason, sense*. They bear this name, because by right pronunciation, they give a right sense and meaning to the words, and by true distinction in reading, they give the sense of the passage."

The ancient Hebrews acknowledge their great importance. Jonathan the Paraphrast, who lived about forty years before Christ, says, "The accents are to the letters what the soul is to the body." Rabbi Judah, on the Mishna, says, "If all the prophets were equal to Moses, they had no power to alter a letter or point of the law."

This, however, is not the case, as will be shewn in a great number of passages which stand opposed to each other, which also, taken alone, are obvious contradictions, but which, by this ancient and true reading, will be reconciled in their respective places. One example for all may give the public an idea how seriously important it is to have the true translation, which can only be had by strictly attending to this most ancient branch of Hebrew learning. In all the translations we read thus in Isaiah, ch. ix. 3, "*Thou hast multiplied the nation, and not increased the joy: they joy before thee according to the joy in harvest, and as men rejoice when they divide the spoil.*" This cannot possibly be the true reading, because the latter part plainly contradicts the former part; but the true translation, according to *Chetib*, or the letter, will shew that there was no necessity for the Keri translators to reject **לֹל lo**, or to substitute **לֹל lov**, instead thereof. Of which below.

Jud. vi. 24. *And Gideon built there an altar unto the Lord, and he called it Jehovah-Shalom.* The scripture was given for our information, but surely no information can possibly be communicated by calling the altar *Jehovah-Shalom*. These words cannot be applied to the altar; if the two words be translated, they read, *Jehovah peace*; but *Jehovah peace* cannot be applied to the altar. Those who understand the accentual reading, will know that **יהוה Jehovah**, cannot be joined with **שלום Shalom**, i. e. *peace*.

In the former verse the same word is rendered by *peace*, and the word **לֹל lov**, to him, is truly so translated. But in the verse under consideration, instead of using the masculine pronoun singular as in the same word, viz. *to him*, as they connected *Jehovah* with *Shalom*, and applied it to the altar; they were obliged to use the neuter pronoun *it*, though there is not a neuter in the language. The word **לֹל lov**, as in the preceding verse, should here be rendered *to him*. This verse corrected by the accents, truly reads, *Then Gideon built there an altar before Jehovah; for Jehovah declared to him, Peace.*

There are some commentators, who not being able to reconcile the contradictions in the common version, have pretended to mend the original Hebrew. These persons generally harness themselves in the trappings of those, who, as they could not account for the discrepancies in the common version, concluded that errors must have been made by the translators, or by the tran-

scribers, in the early ages of the church; and have left behind them voluminous collections of supposed necessary corrections. I shall refer to the following: every intelligent reader will properly estimate the attempts to alter and improve the word of God by the presumptuous inventions of men.

Exod. xv. 2. עֵד חֲמַרְתָּ יָהּ *Gnaaxi vezimrath Jah, my strength and song is Jah.* We are told by these commentators, that "*vezimrath, song, being irregular, should probably be חֲמַרְתָּ *vezimrathi, my song*; agreeably to the Chaldee, Arabic, and Vulgate versions, the 'yod is necessary; six valuable MSS, agree in reading it so."* But if a hundred MSS. were found to agree in reading it thus, we are not to attempt to mend the original, and thus give an improper reading. The English translation is consistent with the original in sense; there was no necessity to transpose the word יָהּ *Jah*; and the possessive pronoun *my* might have been dispensed with, as it does not occur in the Hebrew. The true translation shews, that we have no occasion to adopt such translations; the literal reading is, *My strength and song is Jah.*

By the same objectors, and others who have copied from them, we are told, that "בִּיּוֹם *bayoem zain, on the seventh day*, Gen. ii. 2, is probably corrupted from בִּיּוֹם *bayoem van, on the sixth day*, agreeably to the Samaritan, Greek, and Syriac versions." But these commentators ought to have known, that the clause is not written בִּיּוֹם *bayoem zain*; that is, with the numeral written with the seventh letter of the alphabet, ז *zain*; but the ordinal numbers are used as they always have been in the Hebrew bible; that is, they were always written בִּיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי *bayoem hashabigni, on the seventh day.* Thus they were always written in words at full length, to avoid error. Those who wish to see more of these supposed necessary mendings of the original, may refer to the above-mentioned writers.

SPURIOUS SEPTUAGINT.

I have said that the first Christian churches after the Apostles, I believe about 150 to 200 years after the dispersion of the Jews, had recourse to the Greek translation made by Aquila, called by many learned men the Septuagint; who have shewn that the translation made by the original Seventy, at the request of Ptolemy Philadelphus about 350 years before Christ, was never circulated, but was deposited in the great library of that monarch, and was lost to the world when that library was entirely burnt. The learned Bishop Usher says, 1st, that "the Septuagint translation continually adds to, takes from, and changes the Hebrew text at pleasure. 2dly, That the original translation of it was lost long ago; and what has ever since gone under that name, is a spurious copy, abounding with omissions, additions, and alterations of the Hebrew text." See his Letters.

Dr. Wall says, that the Greek translations of what we call the Septuagint, are all very imperfect; that these translators were but meanly skilled in the language, being Alexandrian Jews, that they have rendered absurdly many passages where their Hebrew copy was evidently the same as the present; that they have suffered much by the overboldness of transcribers, and that the readings have in several copies been severally altered since the time of the Apostles, as is plain from the various readings now seen in the editions made from the different MSS. Origen, about a hundred years after the Apostles, set about making an edition called an Hexapla, with the Hebrew and the Greek translations of it, which had been made by Aquila, Theodotian, and Symmachus. He found the copies so faulty and miswritten in many places, that it cost him great pains by comparing them together, to make something approaching to correctness. And when he had done this, he was obliged to make notes of the differences between that and the Hebrew. And in two

hundred years after this time, the editions of the Septuagint were so far mutilated, that Hierom complained, that the different countries of Christendom read their books of scripture, (i.e. the Septuagint, for that was all the scripture they had of the Old Testament, none then understanding Hebrew) with several variations. At Constantinople, and all the countries beyond that and Antioch, they used the edition which had been corrected by Lucian, a Presbyter, and Martyr of Antioch; in all Palestine, and the country beyond Antioch and Egypt, that of the Hexapla, revised by Eusebius; in Alexandria and all Egypt, an edition corrected by Hesychius. So that Hierom says, the Hebrew names of men, places, and things, having been first misspelt in Greek by one, were written more corruptly by another, till at last, instead of Hebrew names, they were Samaritanical ones. And he acknowledges to Damasus, that the errors in the Greek scriptures had induced him to attempt a Latin translation from the Hebrew. And so we find, that to our time, the Vatican, the Alexandrian, the Aldin, and Complute editions of the Septuagint, have various readings.

These two things, the imperfect skill of the first translators, and the injuries of time which the translations have suffered, will account for the differences between them and the Hebrew, and between any Latin and vulgar translations, and any translation made immediately from the Hebrew.

Some learned men have supposed that the Jews about the year 125, altered various parts of the Hebrew Bible which were in favour of the Christian religion: a supposition so extraordinary, that it is astonishing it should gain any credit. For at this period there were so many copies of the Hebrew and Greek in the hands of the Christians in many nations, that such a thing was impossible; and had it even been attempted by the Jews, such copies would never have been received by the Christians. Justin Martyr, indeed, in three or four places, charges some of the Rabbies with an attempt to fitter away the obvious meaning of the original Hebrew, in their public orations; and Irenæus was of the same opinion; "but neither of them (says Dr. Wall) thought it possible for them to do any such thing," which they certainly would have known, had they done it.

There cannot be a more convincing proof that the present Greek version called the Septuagint, is not the ancient Septuagint, translated in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus, than this—had the present Greek version been the original Septuagint, there then had been no necessity for Aquila, Theodotian, and Symmachus, in the second century, to have given their translations.

These remarks will shew, that if the oldest of all translations, called the Septuagint, be in this disordered state, where in every book we find a great number of verses wanting, we can only depend on the Hebrew. To this great fountain of eternal truth we must appeal; where we shall find no chasms, no deficiencies; the historical narratives and the prophetic writings are all perfect. I therefore refer to *no translations* for even a semblance of authority. I assure the Reader, that it is more safe to depend even on the present authorized version, with all its errors, than on any of the versions made in the first ages of the Christian church, and that for the best of reasons; the Hebrew was only understood by Jews, for we find, as was said, that Jerome in the ninth century, after the return of the Jews from Babylon, or the fourth of the Christian æra, knew very little of it, so that in many places, which were unintelligible in the Greek, he was obliged to make out the sense as well as he could by the assistance of a Jew, who did not understand the Greek and Latin languages. Therefore if the Greek translation made by Aquila so early as the 130th year of the

Christian æra, and those made by Theodotian and Symmachus to about the year 200, "were so faulty" in the time of Origen, that by the corrections he made, he found it difficult to "approach to any thing like truth;" and if Hierom declared that in his day the "Greek translation was so full of errors, that he was induced to attempt a Latin translation from the Hebrew:" we cannot hesitate in determining to a certainty, agreeably to the first Greek fathers, who it must be allowed at this remote period of Christian antiquity, were best able finally to determine this most important point; that the Hebrew scriptures only were to be depended on, in order to gain a true knowledge of the will of God to man.

It is also sufficiently evident, that if the original Septuagint, translated in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus, had been preserved to the time of Aquila, there then had been no necessity for the corrections made by Origen and Hierom. This therefore proves, that there was no ancient Septuagint, or copy of it, in existence in the time of the first fathers of the Christian church.

IMPERFECTION OF THE GREEK BIBLE.

There cannot be a more convincing proof of the imperfection of the Greek Bible, called the Septuagint, agreeably to the settled opinion of the above-mentioned authorities, and that the translator did not understand critically the Hebrew original, than the following: on Gen. xv. 11. The translator of the Septuagint has translated the words יָשֶׁעְ אֹתָם *yasheeb othaam*, rendered in the common version *he drove them away*, by *οὐκ ἐξήγαγεν αὐτοὺς*, *he remained with them*. But the Greek translator has mistaken the root; this word יָשֶׁעְ *yasheeb*, is not from the root יָשָׁב *yaashab*, to remain, to sit, which has been the opinion of some lexicon writers, following the Greek translation; it is from the root נָשָׁב *nashab*, and means an action operating within, to be *breathed into*, not to *breathe out—to inspire*. It is used in this sense, Isa. xl. 7, *The spirit of the Lord bloweth*; this is an allusion to the spirit of God *inspiring*, or being *poured forth* at the coming of the Messiah; see ver. 1 to 7. The word נָשָׁבָה *naashbah*, from this root, is translated in the Latin version of Sebastiani Schmidii, Isa. xl. 7, by *spiravit*. See Buxtorf, Taylor, and others, where this word, which only occurs in three places in the Bible, is rightly placed under נָשָׁב *nashab*, to *inspire*. The learned reader will see, that the Greek and Latin are at variance with each other, and both with the Hebrew, in the translation of this word.

But in the common version it is rendered *he drove away*. This does not give any thing like the sense of the word. Admitting the word to have the action of externally *blowing with the mouth*, Abraham might have sat with the sacrifices, and have blown with his mouth without any effect; the fowls would have remained, and would have devoured the sacrifices. This is evident enough, if any one tries the experiment: no birds are *driven away* by *blowing*, even in these countries, where birds are far more difficult of approach than the ravenous birds are in those hot countries; they are not to be *driven away* by blowing. Besides, as there is no such meaning in the word יָשֶׁעְ *yasheeb*, as *drove*, it is absurd to suppose that Abraham could *blow them away*. To blow, or breathe *inwardly*, to *inspire*, and not outwardly to *expire*, is the meaning of this word:—it cannot mean both *inspire* and *expire*. See Psa. cxlvii. 18, *He causeth his wind to blow*. But the word here properly means, to *inspire*, to *breathe*, or *blow into*; for the interior power must first be given, (*inspired, or given into the belly of the wind*) before the frozen waters can possibly flow.

But there is an objection to the translation of this word, rendered *to blow*, in this Psalm, which cannot be overruled; it has no prefix to justify the liberty of incorporating the word *to* in the text. If, however, the word be rendered *blow*, it is impossible to make sense without putting in the word *to*, which cannot be allowed; whereas we shall find, when the verb is rendered as it stands, without any addition, it must necessarily be translated agreeably to the obvious meaning of its root, *inspire*. Besides, this word, which is the same both consonants and vowels as it is in Gen. xv. 11, cannot here be translated by the infinitive, viz. *blow*, and by the third person singular preter of the verb, viz. *he drove—away*, in the verse under consideration.

There is another objection to the translation of the accompanying word in this Psalm, viz. רוחו *roucho*, which is rendered *his wind*, viz. he causeth *HIS WIND* to blow. I need not enlarge on the impropriety of transposition in the common version of this clause, where the *hiphil* of the verb, i. e. the *cause*, is carried to the noun רוחו *roucho*, viz. HE CAUSETH HIS WIND to blow. But it is necessary to say a few words on the improper expression, *his wind*, which is made so familiar by customary reading, that the absurdity of the expression is passed over.

It is here said in the common version, that *God causeth to blow with HIS wind*. Let the reflecting reader *think* for a moment: Are we not sensible that all the elements were created by the Eternal Spirit? The two invisible elements, the *fire* and the *wind*, and the two visible elements, the *earth* and the *water*? Therefore there was no necessity for the sacred writer to inform us that the *wind* was created by God, in saying *his wind*.

This word literally means, *his spirit*. See where the same word is so translated, Gen. xli. 18; —xxxv. 21; Numb. xi. 29; Deut. ii. 30; Jud. xv. 19; 1 Sam. xxx. 12; Ezra i. 5; Job xxxiv. 14; Psa. lxxviii. 8; —cvi. 38; Dan. ii. 1; Psa. cxlvi. 4, *his breath (spirit) goeth forth*; Prov. xxix. 11; *his mind*. The clause truly reads, without any addition, *his spirit inspireth*. Hence it is evident, that the translator of the modern Greek version, called the *Septuagint*, did not critically understand the Hebrew, or he would have known that in defective verbs the first radical is omitted, and instead thereof the second radical has a *dagesh*. See on Gen. xv. 11.

It may be said by some, that the word יָשַׁב *yasheeb*, rendered *he drove away*, refers to Abraham. This cannot be, for the reasons given above; he could not drive them away when he was in a deep sleep. Nor can this simple verb be translated by a *verb* and an *adverb*. Besides, it is proper to inform the reader, that the 10th verse is parenthetical, and the whole sense of the 11th verse is connected with the 9th verse, where God commanded Abraham to bring the sacrifices. Therefore the verb יָשַׁב *yasheeb*, which is truly rendered by *he inspired*, refers to the person of the verb יָרַד *yeered*, *he descended*; that is, God, who commanded him in the preceding verse, to bring all the animals for the sacrifice, *descended* and *lowered*, הִגְנוּיִית *hag-nauyit*, the *covering*, i. e. the smoke of the incense, which was the covering of the Divine Glory, which from the holy place descended and covered the bodies. Agreeably to what is said, Lev. xvi. 12, 13; Exod. xxv. 22, *And he shall take a censer full of burning coals of fire from off the altar before the Lord, and his hands full of sweet incense beaten small, and bring it within the vail. And he shall put the incense upon the fire before the Lord, that the cloud of the incense may cover the mercy-seat, that is upon the testimony—And there I will meet with thee, and I will commune with thee, from above the mercy-seat, from between the two Cherubims, which are upon the ark of the testimony.*

This communication given to Abraham, I have observed, is also in agreement with the divine communication, which was given at the feast of Pentecost, recorded, Acts ii. 2, *And suddenly there came a sound from heaven, as of a rushing mighty wind.*

Writers of grammars in general, not having ascertained the different modifications of the ו *vau* in other languages (in English answering to between forty and fifty conjunctions) and not having attended to its general use of connecting the tenses of the preceding verbs, have, when they have found the ו *vau* prefixed to verbs in the preter form, and connecting the preceding future, called this ו *vau*, the *vau converse*, as thus converting the preter time of a verb to the future.

Much has been said concerning this subject on 2 Kings v. 18, where the ו *vau*, we are told by some, is converse; maintaining, in opposition to grammar, and the translations of the most learned men in Europe, that notwithstanding Naaman had declared he would not worship any other God but Jehovah, yet that he solicited the prophet for permission and pardon beforehand, when he returned to worship in the house of Rimmon with his lord.

In my translation of 2 Kings v. 18, I have admitted that בְּבוֹא beboa, may be translated as the participle present, and that it makes no difference whether we translate by the participle *coming*, or by the preter *came*; as to the sense of the following verbs, which are in the preter form, נִשְׁגָּן nishgan, rendered *he leaneth*, i.e. *leaning*, as in 1 Sam. i. 6; and וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶינִי ve hishtachaveeti, and *I worshipped*, in the same verse. The words בְּבוֹא אֲדֹנִי beboa adoni, *when my Lord coming*, obviously refer to an action having taken place, otherwise it could not be said *when coming*. Naaman was relating the manner in which he performed his idol worship, when he went into the house of Rimmon, in order that he might know from the prophet whom he was now convinced received the divine communication, whether God would pardon him for the past idolatry, as he now had determined neither to worship nor bow before the idol: he would worship no other God but Jehovah.

Again, it has been supposed that as the preterites are preceded by the future of the verb יִסְלַח yislach (to forgive), the following verb in construction with יִסְלַח yislach, must be according to syntax, likewise in the future tense. This is a manifest error, for if the following verbs in the preter were to be translated in the future time, because connected with the preceding future of the verb יִסְלַח yislach; then there would be no necessity for a ו *vau* converse to these verbs. But this error arises from the ignorance of the nature of propositions, *major* and *minor*; and much confusion is introduced when such writers attempt to translate the Hebrew scripture, who are not only ignorant of the nature of *propositions*, but who are altogether ignorant of the doctrine of *conjunctions* in the language into which they attempt to translate the Hebrew.

A major proposition is a complete sentence, in which any thing is fully affirmed, or decreed, and is governed by the accent *Atnah*, whose presence signifies there are two propositions in the verse. But יִסְלַח yislach, being in the major proposition, and no ו *vau* prefixed to the preter verb נִשְׁגָּן nishgaan, the connection of יִסְלַח yislach, *will he pardon*, ends with the major proposition: and another proposition succeeds under the government of the accent *Silluk*, viz. *In my lord's coming to the house of Rimmon to worship there.*

The following branch of the proposition נִשְׁגָּן הוּא ve houa nishgaan, is in the common version rendered *and he leaneth*. Here we are told the ו *vau* with *shevah* prefixed to the pronoun הוּא houa,

converts the following verb from the preter to the future time. But certainly no Hebrew scholar will say, that the ו *vau* prefixed to the pronoun can be transposed and carried to the preter verb נִשְׁגָּנָא *nishgnaan*, rendered in the common version *leaneth*. Thus we find the ו *vau* with *shevah* prefixed to the pronoun הוּא *houa*, Gen. xxv. 29. וְהוּא עָיָף *Ve houa gnaayeeeph*, and he was weary; now if this doctrine were true, the sentence must be understood in the future time, viz. *and he will be weary*; the action *was past, he was faint*. But it is not possible that it can be so understood, notwithstanding the ו *vau* with *shevah* is prefixed to the pronoun; it is also connected with an action past, viz. וַיָּבֹא *va yabo Esau*, and Esau came. A preceding future is never connected with a verb in the preter form to connect the future, unless such verb in the preter form be prefixed by a ו *vau*, as is evident throughout the scripture, and then the ו *vau* is not *conversive*, but *conjunctive*. Therefore it is evident, that those who pretend to say, "when the ו *vau* with *shevah* is prefixed to a pronoun, it converts the following verb to the future time," are attempting to introduce a new doctrine, and will be reprobated by every critical Hebrew scholar. But the ו *vau* is universally *conjunctive*, even where it is rendered by the conjunction *or*, Exod. xx. 15, וְאִמּוֹ *ve immo*, or his mother; it is conjunctive as to unity of sense with וַיַּכֶּה אָבִיו *ve makeeh abio*, he that smiteth his father.

I have in the following pages shewn the *absolute integrity of the Hebrew text*, that it is as perfect as the autograph of Moses; but there are those who hold a contrary opinion. And we see that such writers are driven to the hackneyed subterfuge of infidels, supposing that interpolations and additions have been made by transcribers. Such writers are calculated to do much injury; for if any part of scripture could be proved to be interpolated, it would shake our faith; it would so far invalidate the sacred record. Thus, respecting the above passage, 2 Kings v. 18, the word נָא *na*, *I pray thee*, is omitted in the common version, as it is in the Latin, from whence the common version was translated. And we are told by some, because commentators have said so, that "it is written, but not read." The answer I have given to this injudicious comment has always been, Why then did the sacred writer insert it? and why did the Septuagint translate it? An answer which is conclusive; for certainly the first Christian Greek translators, who translated the scriptures near 500 years before the Latin Vulgate was translated, received this word as written by the sacred writer, and therefore they translated it.

But such reasoners ask concerning this and other words, "who can say that they have not been inserted in the text?" If, as it has been said by them, that the men of the great synagogue over whom Ezra presided, inserted this and other words, the argument is then decidedly in favour of its translation, as in such case it must have been in the text near 1100 years before the appearance of the Latin Vulgate. But it cannot for a moment be allowed, that Ezra and the men of the great synagogue would have attempted to interpolate any part of the sacred scripture. The religious veneration in which every part of the letter of the sacred scripture was held by the ancient Hebrews, totally precludes the impious attempt of adding one *iota* or *little* to the hallowed word of God. To this day, the descendants of those holy men hold the whole letter of the Hebrew scripture most sacred; nor is there any Christian on earth who has a higher sense of the sanctity of the very letter, than a conscientious Jew.

Therefore, from what has been said concerning the ו *vau* with *shevah* not being *conversive*, either in this or in any other passage of scripture; as no proof can be given in any part of scrip-

ture where the *vau* with *shevah*, prefixed to the pronoun, has any effect on the following verb to convert a preter time to a future; consequently the future of the preceding verb יסלח *yislach*, i.e. *will he pardon*, in the major proposition, is not carried by the *vau* prefixed to the pronoun הוּא *houa*, in the following proposition. It therefore follows, that the verbs וְהִשְׁתַּחֲוִיתִי *ve hishtachaveeti*, and בְּהִשְׁתַּחֲוִיאתִי *be hishtachavaayaati*, cannot be rendered in the future time *to bow*; and therefore, that Naaman did not ask the prophet whether God would grant him an indulgence to worship the idol in the house of Rimmon, but that the pardon he solicited, was a pardon for his past idolatry; and the prophet answers him in the affirmative, *Go in peace*. Consistently with the divine command, they were not even to countenance a *bowing* before the idols, either among themselves, or among other nations; *Thou shalt not bow down to them*, Exod. xx.

Now when we consider that the cure of Naaman was done by the power of God to break in pieces the idolatry of Syria, that it had this effect on Naaman, and that if he had returned to his land making the same profession of idol worship, although he had experienced this great cure, as he acknowledged, by the hand of the God of Israel, instead of shewing the Syrian nation the folly of depending on idols; such a proceeding on the part of Naaman, sanctioned by the prophet of God, would have more firmly established the people of Syria in the worship of idols. The common translation of this passage can never be allowed by any sound grammarian, or any learned and conscientious Jew or Christian. It is not as such writers always say, when they meet with peculiar arrangements and phrases which they have not understood, "It is according to the peculiar genius of the language." The genius of a language, and the grammar of a language, cannot be at variance with each other, except by an abuse of the rules of grammar.

VERBS IN THE FUTURE FORM, NOT TO BE TRANSLATED IN THE PAST TIME.

In announcing this work to the public, I selected a few passages from the common translation, which I contrasted with the corresponding ones in the new translation, that the reader might be satisfied respecting the absolute necessity of a revision of the sacred scripture. But, notwithstanding so many of our most learned men have shewn, that a new revision of the scripture is necessary for the support and credit of the Bible against the calumnies of its adversaries, some objections have been made; and I have thought it proper to make a few remarks concerning such unfounded assertions, to satisfy the inquirer after truth, that what I have there done, is perfectly consistent with the obvious meaning of the sacred writer, and with the grammar of the language. And as the objections to a few passages of my translation are presumed by the objectors to be made on the impossibility of translating certain verbs in the tense in which the inspired writer has written them; I hope that my remarks in answer, will give much information on those subjects, and assist those who *even know nothing of Hebrew*, to silence such objections in future.

Thus we are told by such writers, "it is peculiar to the genius of the Hebrew, that verbs in the future form are frequently translated in the preter time." I am referred to the introduction of the song of Moses, Exod. xv. 1, which in the common versions is translated *Then sang Moses*. The verb יָאָשִׁיר *yaashir*, is the future form of the verb, which, we are told, is necessarily translated in the preter tense, viz. *he sang*. I acknowledge that it appears to be a singularity; but we shall find that this arises from a total ignorance of the order of the divine communication under that representative dispensation.

It has been supposed that there was no regular order of the priesthood before the Levitical priesthood; but I shall shew in the following pages, that a regular priesthood was established from the beginning, and that the Hebrews brought with them a tabernacle out of Egypt, before that which Moses was commanded to erect. And if either Jews or Christians had made themselves acquainted with the order of the divine communication, that nothing of this nature was ever given but in the way which God had appointed from between the Cherubim, and never but when the sacrifice was upon the altar; and if they had connected the communication which commences at the latter part of the preceding chapter, with the first proposition in this verse; there had been no necessity to have translated this verb, which is in the future form, in the preter tense.

If the reader will turn to the 9th verse of the preceding chapter, he will find that the Hebrews, after they had left Egypt, had encamped by the sea; and, as in all their encampments, the tabernacle and the Cherubim for the divine instruction, were set up, they made application for that instruction whenever they were in difficulties. Then it was that they were instructed how to proceed, and the communication is given, beginning at the 15th verse, to the מלאך *malake*, angel, (Heb.) messenger of God, who went before the camp of Israel, ver. 19. In the 26th verse, God commands Moses by this messenger, *to stretch out his hand*. The 27th, to the end of the 31st verses, are a complete parenthesis; for the first clause of the first verse of the 15th chapter, is a part of the divine command connected with, and given in the above 26th verse of the preceding chapter, and which, connected without the parenthesis, reads truly, without being under the necessity of translating the future form of the verb in the preter time. I shall give the clause in this 1st verse connected with the 26th verse, verbatim, according to the Hebrew. *And the Lord said before Moses, Stretch out thine hand over the sea, that the waters may come again upon the Egyptians, upon their chariots, and upon their horsemen*, ver. 1, THEN MOSES SHALL SING THIS SONG WITH THE CHILDREN OF ISRAEL. Therefore it evidently appears, that this song, which has been supposed to have been composed by Moses, was given in the divine communication to the attending messenger of God, delivered by him to Moses, and by Moses through the priesthood, delivered to the children of Israel. From which, if the whole subject be understood, it will appear to those who are willing to be convinced, that there is no necessity for translating the future of a verb in the preter tense.

Again, it is supposed that a verb in the future time is often to be translated in the preter time; we are referred to Gen. ii. 5, יִיְהִי *yihyeh*, which is rendered *it was*, viz. *before it was in the earth*. But it does not follow that it should be translated in the past time; it reads with great propriety as the sacred writer has given it, thus, *Before it should be in the earth*; also יִצְמַח *yitsmaach*, rendered *it grew*, in the same verse, literally reads, *before it should grow*.

But in the following verse וַאֲדָר יַעֲלֶה *ve ced yagnaleh*, which is translated, *But there went up a mist*, is supposed by these perverters of the meaning of the sacred writer, to be a conclusive proof that the *future time* of the verb was not intended by the inspired writer to signify the *future time*. If the reader attends to the progressive order of the creation, he will find that the venerable writer was giving an account of the *creation of the heaven and the earth*, ver. 4, when the stupendous fabric was finished, before the ALMIGHTY BUILDER had sent forth the principles of generation, before the plant of the field began to spring forth, before the herb of the field began to grow—even before they were in the earth. And in conformity with this state of the creation, before the creation

of man, before God had caused it to rain on the earth; the sacred writer says—*There was not a man to till the ground*,—ver. 6, *Till a mist should ascend from the earth*. From which it is evident, that there was no necessity for the writers of grammars, and those who copy from them, to assert what is so decidedly contrary to the declaration of the sacred writer, viz. that there was an absolute necessity for the verb written in the simple future time, to be translated in the preter time.

But as it makes no difference in the sense whether these three verbs be translated in the preter or in the future time : as the sense is the same, whether we say—*before it was—before it grew—and a mist ascended—or, before it should be—before it should grow—or, till a mist should ascend—I have retained the present version, as I do in all cases where nothing is gained by deviating from it, these three verbs translated in the preter time, being more familiar according to the customary usage of the English language.*

Here we have the first account of the true principles of natural philosophy, *The Lord God had not caused it to rain upon the earth, and there was not a man to till the ground*. It must appear that until God had caused it to rain upon the earth, no mist could possibly ascend from the earth to water the face of the ground; and it must be equally as evident, that there was no necessity for man to till the ground, till there had been rain, and a mist arising in consequence, to water the face of the ground in order to cause the fruitful germ to spring.

PRETER OF THE VERB NOT TO BE RENDERED IN THE FUTURE.

It is also said by these pretenders to grammatical knowledge, that verbs in the simple preter form, are to be frequently translated in the future time. If this doctrine were true, it would certainly make the Hebrew, which is the most certain, the most uncertain language in the world. And we are told by these writers, that this constitutes one of the greatest beauties in the language. These assertions may be substituted as an apology for ignorance; but certainly no rational man can see any beauty in what is so preposterously incongruous; so inconsistent with the philology of all languages, and so opposed to the obvious meaning of the sacred writer, as I shall shew in what follows :—

The following examples have been adduced to shew that the preter of the verb must necessarily be translated in the future time. The learned reader will see that these writers frequently lead the searchers for truth into error and uncertainty respecting those things which, when understood agreeably to the meaning of the sacred writer, are plain and express.

Deut. xxxii. 39, מַּאֲחַטְטִי *maachatti*, *I wound*, is adduced to shew that the preter is to be rendered by the future. But this word, even in the common version, certainly does not express the future; it evidently refers to a past action still going on. It could not be said *I wound*, unless the person so speaking had wounded. The word *wound* is the present tense, and such pseudo critics ought to have known that the present tense has no existence in Hebrew, and that it is not supplied by the preter form of the verb, but by *benoni*, the participle active. This word is the perfect, and ought to be so translated, viz. מַּאֲחַטְטִי *I have wounded*; it then follows with proper effect, וְאֲנִי מְרַפֵּא *and I, I will heal*.

Again, ver. 41, שְׁנוֹתִי *shenoti*, is rendered, by these critics, *I shall whet*; but this is an abuse of grammar: the common version has something approximating to the truth, viz. *I whet*; which,

like the last verb, could not be said, unless the action had taken place; it is the *perfect*, not the *participle*, and should be rendered *I have whetted*.

Again, 1 Sam. ix. 6, הָלַכְנוּ *haalaknou*, is translated *we should go*; which, like all, noticed by these objectors, is taken from the common version. If they had understood the subject, or were critically acquainted with the language, they would be sensible that they have given a false translation. Also the word עִירָא *gnaaleyah*, *to it*, or *to her*, i. e. the city, is omitted; the verb is in the perfect tense, and should be rendered in the preter as the same verb is in Mal. iii. 14, *we have walked*. The clause reads, וְאִשָּׁר הָלַכְנוּ עִירָא *when we have walked to it*.

Job xix. 27, רָאִוּ *Raaou*, *they shall see*, is another example given to shew that the preter form of the verb is to be translated in the future time. But this is also taken as it stands in the common version; without attending to the grammatical construction of the word. The verb is in the perfect tense, and must be so translated to get the true meaning of the original; see where the same word both consonants and vowels, is so translated, Exod. x. 6; Deut. iv. 9;—x. 21, *have seen*, and so throughout the scripture.

Job here refers to his priestly office when he received the divine communication in the Holy of Holies, and he says, וְעֵינֵי רָאִוּ *ve gneene raaou*, *for mine eyes have seen*.

This passage in Job, when truly translated as the sacred writer has written it, gives us important information. Job says in the preceding verse, *I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth*: and the reason why he spake so decidedly, he gives in this verse, by the verb, רָאִוּ *raaou*, *have seen*, viz. *For mine eyes have seen*; not, as in the common version, *And mine eyes shall behold*. The eyes of Job had seen the divine glory manifested in the cloud of the incense in the Holy of Holies, and therefore he declares with a confidence, not to be shaken by all the arguments of his self-righteous visitors, *I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth*.

Thus I have shewn that these verbs, which have been chosen by these writers to prove that the future is to be translated as the preter, and the preter as the future, can be translated as the venerable penman has left them; and that the tenses being retained agreeably to their grammatical form, give us the true meaning of the original.

Hence it evidently appears from the above examples, (which have been resorted to by mere copiers from the common version, to prove that such an incongruity was necessary, as that of a verb in the simple preter form, being translated in the future time, and a verb in the simple future form being translated in the past time) that no such thing is necessary, nor was ever understood by the venerable penman. It is so plain a contradiction to every rule of grammar, is so opposed to truth in every part of scripture, to the current arrangement of rational ideas, modes of speech, and to the philology and philosophy of language; that it is surprising how many intelligent men, writers of grammars, could be led into such an absurdity.

And when it is seen from the above examples, that there is no necessity for this outrage on common sense; if any Hebrew scholar should still continue to publish such doctrine, I conclude he will be reprobated by every sober critic, who will feel it his imperious duty to translate agreeably to the obvious intention of the inspired writer, and the unimpeachable holiness of the sacred letter. But particularly so, when any elucidation is consequent on translating such passages as they stand in the original.

OBJECTIONS RESPECTING THE PASSAGES ANSWERED.

Some, from reading, in the Prospectus, the translation of Gen. vi. 4, which in the common version reads, *There were giants in the earth in those days*; have, without waiting to read the article on that passage, condemned it; and have endeavoured to confirm the old version, by referring to several passages to shew that the children of Anak, Numb. xiii. 33, were *giants*, men of great stature. We are told by these objectors, "That the children of Anak were giants is very plain, from the passage in Deut. ix. 2, *The children of Anak are a TALL, and mighty people.*" But this is the common translation, and, therefore, surely no man understanding the Hebrew language will seriously say, that עַם גָּדוֹל *gām gadol varaam*, can possibly be translated, *A people great and tall!* The word *varaam*, which is here rendered by *tall*, is only so translated in this and the corresponding chapters, Deut. i. 28;—ch. ii. 10, 11;—ch. ix. 2, where the translators have absurdly applied it to magnitude of stature. Whereas in every passage of scripture where it occurs, amounting to some hundreds, it means a *haughty, lofty, proud, presumptuous* state of the mind. So that these people, the Anakims, were the descendants of their chief, Anak, a governing family. And whether it be taken under the root רָם *rom*, or רָמַם *ramam*, it has the same meaning, viz. to be *exalted* in mind above others, from the accident of birth, or situation in life. Had the translators even preserved the meaning of the word γίγαντες *gigantes*, *earth-born*, the word chosen by the Greek translators for נְפִילִים *nēphīlīm*, i.e. *apostates*, rendered *giants*; there could have been no objection. They were *earth-born*, not *heaven-born*; they had *apostatized*, had forsaken the true worship of God for that of idols. Hence has arisen the fabulous tales concerning *giants*; and it is astonishing that men are found in this enlightened age, who can soberly suppose that a nation of men lived in the land of Canaan, who, among the other inhabitants, were men of an enormous stature. I know it may be said that Og and Goliath were men of great stature; but they were not called נְפִילִים *nephīlīm*, *apostates*. And we shall find, when we come to those passages concerning Og and Goliath, that a solitary few are to be found in every age, who have exceeded the height of men in general. Such writers are not calculated to recommend the Bible to the notice of intelligent men. The notion of *witches, necromancers, conjurors, familiar spirits, and giants*, is giving way to rational truth. I leave such writers in the enjoyment of the Rabbinnical tradition, "that when the flood was upon the earth, and fifteen cubits above the highest mountains, the body of Og, the king of Bashan, being the last of the giants, reached above the ark, and thus was preserved."

A few injudicious remarks have been laid before the public, in which the writers have objected to my translation of Gen. vi. 6, which is translated in the common version, *And it repented the Lord that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart.* I refer the reader to the article on the passage, where I have shewn that this word never means to *repent*, in any part of scripture. It is necessary, however, to say a few words in answer to what is said by some concerning the words וַיִּתְּנָטֶעֶב אֱלֹהִים *va yithgnatseeb el libo*, which is rendered in the common version, *And it grieved him at his heart*; but which I have translated, *though he idolized himself at his heart.*

To prove that this word וַיִּתְּנָטֶעֶב *yithgnatseeb*, means to *grieve*, such reference has been made to other passages, where one of the senses of this word means to *grieve*. That in a secondary sense it means to *grieve*, may be allowed, because the worship of idols brought grief and trouble to the worshippers; but I have shewn that in a primary sense, it means as a verb to *idolize*, from the

noun עֲצָבִי *gnatsabee, idols*. See Psa. cxxxv. 15;—cvi. 38; 1 Sam. xxxi. 9; 1 Chron. x. 9; Isa. xlv. 1; Mic. i. 7, &c. It was a name which the Canaanites, and in imitation of them, the apostatizing Hebrews, gave to the idols they worshipped. See 2 Sam. v. 21; 1 Sam. xxxi. 9; Psa. cvi. 38; Isa. xlv. 1, &c. Now it must appear to every sober-minded man; that God did not *grieve himself at his heart*, as it would lead us to suppose that he is no more than man; and that when he created man, he did not know the circumstances and things which were to take place, agreeably to his appointment. Also, as consistently with the construction, it refers to the man, as the most proximate noun; as God cannot *grieve himself*, for something he did not foresee; and as it is evident that man from the fall has been in the constant habit of *idolizing himself*; it necessarily follows, that the new translation is perfectly consistent with the dignity and foreknowledge of the Creator; and, as the lamentable facts prove, it is only applicable to man.

Gen. xx. 16, *Behold, he is to thee a covering of the eyes, to all that are with thee and with all other: thus she was reprov'd.* I have rendered the passage, *Behold, he is to thee a covering of the eyes to all that are with thee, and with all: thus she was justified.* It is remarked by these objectors, that the word וְנִכְחַת *venokaachath*, is interpreted by me, *thus she was justified.* I recommend such writers to turn to the Rabbi Onkelos, who says on this passage, “And in all that thou hast said, אֵיטוֹקָאֶחַת *eyitokaachath*, thou art justified;” and to the Rabbi Rashi, who says בִּירוֹר דְּבָרִים *berur debaarim*, clearing up the matter.

The root of this word is taken by these writers to be נִכַּח *nokach*, signifying present, and not יָכַח *yokach*. It is not however under נִכַּח *nokach*, it is under יָכַח *yokach*. But these objectors have the modesty to say, that they “express this opinion with diffidence.” Well may these writers say, that they “express this opinion with diffidence”—it is indeed expressed in great ignorance. See the learned Buxtoff, under יָכַח *yokach*. Such objectors are calculated to do much injury to the religion of the Bible. From such conclusions, modern Christian commentators have most erroneously said, that Sarah told a wilful lie, as well as Abraham. What good such writers can propose by eudeavouring to shew, that the holy man—the great founder of the Hebrew nation, and Sarah, were liars; I am at a loss to determine. See the note on this verse, where I have shewn that they both spake the truth, and nothing but the truth.

1 Sam. xix. 9, *And the evil spirit from the Lord was upon Saul; which I have translated, Now the spirit of Jehovah was displeased with Saul.* This is a literal translation; for it cannot be allowed that *an evil spirit from the Lord was upon Saul*. It is contended that רָעָה *raagnah*, means *evil*—granted; but the same word necessarily has different modifications according to idiom, as *hurt*, Gen. xxvi. 29; *bad*, Numb. xiii. 19; ch. xxiv. 13; *wrong*, Jud. xi. 27; *mischievous*, 1 Kings xx. 7; *trouble*, Psa. xxvii. 5; *displeasure*. I can see no difference whether we say, *The spirit of Jehovah was displeased with Saul*; or, *The spirit of the Lord was a trouble to Saul*.

On 1 Sam. xix. 24, in the common version, it is said that *Saul took off his clothes, and prophesied naked a whole day and night*. And in the translation of this verse I have been accused of having mistaken עָרֹם *gnaarum*, *subtil*, for עָרֹם *gnaarom*, *naked*. I have not made any mistake; the words עָרֹם *gnaarum*, and עָרֹם *gnaarom*, are not different roots, they both mean to be *subtil*, either with a view to produce good, or with a view of circumventing the intentions and devices of others. See where עָרֹם *gnaarum*, means *subtil*, Gen. iii. 1; and where עָרֹם *gnaarom*, has the same meaning, 1 Sam. xxiii. 22.

These words, ערם *gnaarum*, and ערם *gnaarom*, also mean *naked*; but according to construction, they can never be mistaken when applied to mean nakedness of body. See Job i. 21 xxiv. 7, 10; xxvi. 6; Eccles. v. 14; Isa. xii. 2, 3, 4; Amos. ii. 16.

The word ערם *gnaarum*, also means *prudent*, not only "when it is applied to men," because we find when it is applied to men, as opposing evil by evil, or fighting by fighting, that it means *subtil*; but it signifies *prudent*, when it is connected with the wisdom of man. See Prov. xii. 16, 23—xiii. 16—xiv. 8—xxii. 3—xxvii. 12.

But these distinctions in the application of the word, have not been understood by these pseudo-Hebraists. From which it appears that I have not "mistaken the word ערם *gnaarum*, for ערם *gnaarom*;" but such writers have been mistaken, who have not understood the mode of speech which is common in every language. The serpent was *subtil*, because it was the instrument of evil; Saul was *artful*, because he supplicated before Samuel in *hypocrisy*, with a design to murder David. A wise man who covereth shame, is *prudent*, but the wrath of a fool is presently known, Prov. xii. 16.

Ver. 25 of 2 Sam. ii. in the common version, reads, *Notwithstanding they hearkened not unto the voice of their father, because the Lord would slay them*. I conclude, that if the sons of Eli had known that *the Lord would slay them* for not hearkening to the voice of their father, as is signified in the common version, they would have hearkened to his instruction.

But this, like the others, has been varied by these writers; and an attempt to alter it from my translation has been made, not in sense, but in words: whether for the better or the worse, the learned, as well as the intelligent reader will soon determine.

We are told that, "it would be more conformable to the syntax of the Hebrew, to say—but *they would not listen to the voice of their father, so the Lord would have them die*." This may sound learnedly with those who are not acquainted with the Hebrew; but there certainly is no difference in sense, between—*they hearkened not*—and, *they would not listen*—only that the latter is not consistent with the Hebrew, there being no subjunctive mood in the language; neither is there any necessity for it in a true translation of this verse. Nor is there any material difference in sense, between—*Therefore it pleased Jehovah to cause them to die*, and, *so the Lord would have them die*—only the last clause, like the former, is not according to the Hebrew.

The word חפץ *chaapheets*, which means *pleased*, is the third person singular preter of the verb, viz. *he was pleased*; but it is omitted in the common version: I therefore have translated the passage agreeably to the Hebrew, word for word, thus—*Notwithstanding they hearkened not to the voice of their father, therefore it pleased Jehovah to cause them to die*.

An objection has been made to my translation of Isa. vi. 10, which in the common version reads, *Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes: lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their hearts, and convert, and be healed*. The objectors say, that all the three verbs חשך *hashmeen*, חבד *hakbeed*, and חשך *haashang*, are in the imperative mood of the conjugation Hiphil. When such bold assertions are made, with an appearance of something in the shape of a grammatical knowledge of the Hebrew; the reader will be surprised to find that they are not altogether to be believed. I am *advised* by such writers "to consult the Rabbi Solomon Isaac," commonly called by abbreviation, Rashi, on these passages. By so doing, I am told "that such interpretations and objections can only originate from my not

having a proper knowledge of the language." It appears, however, that the *advisers*, who have desired me to consult the above-mentioned Rabbi, are not capable of consulting him; for he perfectly agrees in sense with what I have said on this verse. This learned Rabbi had a just understanding of this important passage, for he shews, agreeably to the translation I have given, that the moral character of God is not to be impeached by the justice of man, which is evidently the plain meaning in the common version. He says, כִּס וְהִכְבֵּד אֶת לִבּוֹ *kemo vehakbeed eth libo*, "his heart is continually obdurate." וְלֹאךְ פָּעַל לֵבָב וְלֹאךְ הָאֹרֶךְ הַזֶּה *Haalouk paagnoul, libaam holceek haalok ve hashmeen*, the meaning of which is, "continually acting; their heart going continually and fattens." וְאָזְנוֹ הוֹלְכִים וְלֹאךְ הַזֶּה מִשְׁמֹעַ *Vaasnaa holkim haaloke vehakbeed mishmoang*, "and his ears continually going on with a hardness of hearing."

From which it appears, that Rashi was clearly of opinion, that not any of these verbs could be understood to be according to the common acceptation in the Hiphil conjugation; because in such case it would make it appear, that God was the sole cause of the wickedness of the people. And this opinion of that eminent Rabbi is confirmed by the verb הָאֵשׁ *haashang*, to turn; which is the third person singular preter in the conjugation Kal, viz. *he turned*, and not "the imperative mood of the conjugation Hiphil," as is asserted by these writers. It is the last verb which finishes the major proposition, viz. HE TURNED *his eyes aside*; which is sufficient to convince us, that God did not turn *his eyes aside*. And as this verb הָאֵשׁ *haashang*, *he turned*, is the last word in the proposition, and inseparably thus connected with the two former verbs in the same proposition, viz. הָאֵשׁ *hashmeen*, was made gross, and הִכְבֵּד *hakbeed*, was made heavy; it plainly follows, that the sense of הָאֵשׁ *haashang*, *he turned*, being applied to the people as having turned the eyes aside, the former verbs in the same proposition cannot be understood as spoken by God to the prophet, to make their heart fat, and their ears heavy: but evidently refer to the people themselves, whose heart was made gross by indulging in sensuality. This is in perfect conformity with the opinion of the ancient Hebrews, according to the declarations of the abovementioned most eminent Rabbies.

Concerning the passage, Amos iii. 6, *Shall a trumpet be blown in the city, and the people not be afraid? Shall evil be in the city, and the Lord hath not done it?* The last clause of which I have translated, *And Jehovah hath not requited it*. It is hardly to be believed, that objectors are to be found bold enough to say, that נָקַם *gnaasah*, is never found in the sense of, to requite. If the reader will turn to 2 Sam. ii. 6, he will find that the word is found in the sense of, to requite: *And now the Lord shew kindness and truth unto you: and I also (נָקַם egneseh) will requite you this kindness*. It is incumbent on men who attempt to translate, and who find fault with what they obviously have not understood; in the first place to understand the plain meaning and acceptation of words: for, surely, to do, execute, make, requite, is the meaning of this word, according to idiom, throughout the scripture.

Jer. xx. 7, *O Lord thou hast deceived me, and I was deceived: thou art stronger than I, and hast prevailed*. I have observed, that if God deceived the prophet, as is plainly stated in the vulgar version; then whatever the consequence of such deception had been, the prophet could not be blameable. God however is, in the common version, said to have deceived him.

I have translated the words פִּיתְחָנִי וַאֲפָאֶתְךָ *pithani vaepaath*, *thou hast persuaded me, thus I was persuaded*. It is with great reluctance admitted by these objectors, that "these words certainly

admit of such interpretation, as well as that in our Bible. However, that it is generally used in the sense of persuading a person in a bad cause, or to an evil deed." It must then be allowed, if this were the true translation, that God persuaded the prophet "in a bad cause, or to an evil deed." To prove which, I am referred to Exod. xxii. 16; Prov. i. 10; xvi. 29, where this word is translated *entice*: "and hence by analogy, to entice, to deceive." But the word *entice* is applicable to good, or evil; for a person may be enticed to follow that which is good: therefore the word *entice* can have no "analogy," no resemblance or agreement in one common mode, with *deceive*: they are words opposed to each other, both as to meaning and application. The translation I have given is confirmed by other parts of scripture: see 1 Kings xxii. 1, 20; Prov. xxv. 25. The clause reads, *Thou hast persuaded me, O Jehovah, thus I was persuaded*. How industriously some men will labour to carry their argument, even against the truth itself; by representing the sacred writer as having declared, that God had deceived him!

Jer. iv. 10. *Then said I, Ah, Lord God, surely thou hast greatly deceived this people, and Jerusalem, saying, Ye shall have peace; whereas the sword reacheth to the soul*. These objectors say, that to the words חֲשֵׁהָ חֲשֵׁהָ *hashee hisheetha*, I have affixed the sense of, *to desolation thou hast desolated*. By which remark, many would suppose that these words have no such meaning. We are also told that they are in the Hiphil conjugation, by which remark, it would also be understood that I have mistaken the conjugation. But the conjugation is obvious enough to any one who can conjugate a verb. I would ask, Is there any difference between doing a thing, and causing it to be done? Nor have the translators of the common version erred; therefore such a remark is improper.

In this clause, as in all the others I have noticed in an answer to these writers, no attention has been given to the choice of words according to idiom; for where a word can be found in the common version, though erroneously translated; it is seized, and brought to prove the unscriptural opinions of these objectors. We are told that "the root of the word חֲשֵׁהָ *hisheetha*, (which I have translated, *thou hast desolated*) is under נָשָׂא *naasha*, signifying to deceive, disappoint, beguile; and not שָׁחַ *shoah*, signifying to make a noise, to rage, to distress. Hence the conjugation Hiphil is pointed with a dagesh forte, to compensate for the נ *num*, being the first letter of the root, which is deficient in this conjugation." This sounds learnedly, but it is no proof that the word שָׁחַ *shoah*, has no other meaning than *noise, rage, distress*. See where the same radical word חֲשֵׁהָ *hosheetha*, which I have rendered *desolation*, under the root שָׁחַ *shoah*, is not only rendered by *desolation*, but the ו *shin* is pointed with a dagesh, Lam. iii. 47; see also Ezek. xxxviii. 9. Therefore this is no proof of the truth of these remarks.

Concerning the passage under consideration, the following are quoted to prove, that God is capable of deception. I am referred to Gen. iii. 13, *The serpent has deceived me*. It is not said even in the common version, *the serpent has deceived me*; but, *the serpent has beguiled me*. The word *beguiled* is certainly more proper than the word "deceived," which is thus boldly used to *deceive* the reader. There is a pointed distinction between the word *deceive*, and *beguile*. Guile, means *cunning, artifice, sly, to circumvent, to entrap*; and the original word is varied according to idiom. But surely no person understanding the idiom of the Hebrew, or of any language, will indiscriminately apply words which suit neither the idea, nor

the person. Eve was not "deceived," for then she would have been excusable; as God must have known that she would be deceived, and it would appear that he created her for this end. She perfectly well knew that God had commanded them not to transgress; and she also perfectly understood the nature and the effect of the transgression, ch. ii. 17, *For in the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die.*

This word has various modes of expression, all partaking of the nature of the root, as words have in all languages; and consequently various applications agreeably to idiom. It means *desolation*, Lam. iii. 47; *waste*, Isa. xxxvii. 26. And so in reference to an invading army, *rushing*, ch. xvii. 12; *destruction*, ch. xxiv. 12; to *exact*, Psa. lxxxix. 22; *seize*, lv. 15; *deprive*, Job xxxix. 17. Also to *beguile* or *excite*. See 2 Kings xix. 10, *Let not Hezekiah deceive thee.* But this will not apply; *יָשׁוּכָה* *yashoka*, means here to *waste*, to *desolate*, as the king of Assyria was then desolating the cities, ver. 8. The passage plainly means, that if any opposition were made to the conquering arms of the king of Assyria, they were threatened with entire *desolation*, and thus the opposition is applied to them as the cause of their desolation. Jer. xxix. 8, *Let not your prophets and your diviners, יָשׁוּכָה* *yashou, desolate you*; that is, be the cause of your desolation; referring to the Babylonians, as being the cause of their desolating them, who had *wasted* them, and had desolated their cities by carrying the people into captivity. Surely it is nothing short of blasphemy to say, as these writers have translated the clause, viz. "Thou hast justly deceived this people," ch. xxxvii. 9; which truly reads, *waste not, or desolate not yourselves.* Ch. xlix. 16, *Thy terribleness hath desolated thee*; Obad. ver. 2, *The pride of thy heart hath desolated thee.*

The same sense is embraced under *נִשְׁחָה* *nishah*, in the Hiphil conjugation, which is evidently of the same meaning as *הִשְׁחָה* *haashah*. See Job xxxix. 17, *הִשְׁחָה* *hishah, deprive*; ch. xi. 6, *יָשַׁח* *yasheh, exacteth*. And, lastly, under *נָשָׂה* *nasha*, in the Hiphil conjugation, which is confidently said by these objectors only to mean *deceive, disappoint, beguile*; we have words evidently derived from *הִשְׁחָה* *hashah*, i. e. *waste, desolation*. Psa. lxxxix. 22, where the word is used to shew the desolating power of an enemy, *The enemy shall not exact on him*; that is, *desolate him*, by making contributions; and lv. 15, *seize upon them*.

So that whether we take the words *הִשְׁחָה* *hashee hisheetha*, to *desolation thou hast desolated*; under *נִשְׁחָה* *shaah*, i. e. *waste, desolate*; *נָשָׂה* *nashah*, i. e. to *exact, deprive*; or *נָשָׂה* *nasha*, to *exact, seize*; it is of no consequence, as under all these words the meaning and application will be the same, and consistent with the narrative. Which shews that these words are of the same origin, and that the two—*נָשָׂה* *nashah*, to *exact, to deprive*; and *נָשָׂה* *nasha*, to *exact, seize*—are under their parent root *הִשְׁחָה* *shaah*, to *waste, to desolate*, notwithstanding the lexicon writers have erroneously divided the word into three roots. All these things signified by these words, are the common result of an invading army, which *desolates, seizes, exacts, deprives*.

Hence, as it is not possible that God can either *deceive* or *tempt* man, it will appear that these labourers to establish an opinion so opposite to the obvious meaning of the original, and the holy character of God, have been altogether mistaken concerning the necessary variation of words according to idiom. Therefore the true translation, as I have given it, confirmed by the obvious meaning of the word in other parts of scripture, is; *Then I said, Ah! Lord Jehovah, behold to desolation thou hast desolated this people, even to Jerusalem, for saying, Peace shall be among you; but the sword reacheth to the soul.*

Thus it appears that it was not God that *deceived the people and Jerusalem, saying, Peace shall be among you.* But it was God who caused the desolation even to Jerusalem, because the false prophesiers had declared, in contradiction to the word of God by the prophet Jeremiah, that the land should have peace. Therefore God suffered the desolation of the people, because they believed the false prophets, *for saying, peace shall be among you.* See the Targum, Jonathan, Rashi, and Kimchi, who give the same meaning.

Isaiah ix. 8, *Thou hast multiplied the nation and not increased the joy; they joy before thee according to the joy in harvest, and as men rejoice when they divide the spoil.*

This passage is one of those which has perplexed all commentators in all ages, for the last clause plainly contradicts the first. The first states, that God had multiplied the nation, but that he had not increased the joy; the second, that they rejoiced before him as men who returned from the harvest, or as those rejoiced who divided the spoil. In some of my Prospectuses, I put it as an interrogative, and which indeed gives a sense consistent with the meaning of the sacred writer. For I never could be induced to give credit to the interpretation of the Masorites, who have said that *לֹא lo*, in this verse, which is translated by *not*, as in other parts of scripture, should be written *לֵי לוֹ lov*, and translated *to him*, viz. *Thou hast multiplied the nation, and to him increased joy.* And this unjustifiable liberty they have taken in fifteen passages, of which they could not make sense, without casting out the word *לֹא lo*; which in truth is absolutely necessary to the true sense of those passages, as written and obviously understood by the sacred writer.

This, however, is a liberty that I dare not take; viz. to *reject*, or *alter* a single word or letter, which stands in every Hebrew Bible in the world. Had not the Jews been appointed by the superintending providence of God to guard the ancient letter of scripture, I have no doubt but that this word *לֹא lo*, which throughout the scripture universally is a negative without exception, would have been changed for *לֵי lov*, i.e. *to him*, and incorporated in the text, as written by the sacred writer.

These objectors, however, have swept the word *לֹא lo*, i.e. *not*, entirely from the passage, and have not even had the modesty, like the Masoretic commentators, to substitute any other word in its stead; for they have presumptuously told us, that "this verse ought to be translated thus," *Thou hast multiplied the nation, and increased its joy.* And yet these scripture menders say in a note, "The sense may be more properly expressed by, *Thou hast caused the Gentiles to be prosperous.*" But this is far from the sense of the original; and it is also contradicted by Onkelos, Jonathan, Rashi, and Kimchi, who say that this passage was not spoken concerning the Gentiles, but concerning the Hebrews.

On a close attention to the original, connected with the whole sense of the narrative, I find that the negative must be retained in the translation, as I have retained it; but that it is not necessary to translate the first clause interrogatively. This error, which has been copied into all the European translations from the versions made in the first ages of the Christian church, has been made by the improper translation of the word שָׂמְחוּ *shaamchou*; which is translated as the present tense of the word *joy*, viz. *they joy*. But it is the third person plural preter, in the conjugation Kal, and should be translated as the same word, both consonants and vowels, is in Psa. xxxv. 15, *they rejoiced*. Thus we shall have a true translation of this hitherto controverted and contradictory passage, perfectly consistent with the grammar of the language, without substituting the daring and

ungrammatical interpolation of the Masoretic commentators; which has been resorted to by writers of this description to the present day.

In this chapter, the prophet was commanded to make known the judgments that were coming on Judah, Israel, and Syria, for their idolatry. He informed them in the preceding chapter, that because the people had refused the waters of Shiloh, that the enemy should *pass through Judah, and the stretching out of his wings should fill the breadth of the land*. The prophet addressing himself to God, then says; *Thou hast multiplied the nation, thou hast not increased the joy*. That is, they had become a numerous people; but having departed from the true worship, he informs them that the *joy, rejoicing, or prosperity* of the church, was not as in time past.

The prophet then speaks of the flourishing state of the church in time past, under the figure of a vineyard, ch. v. 1, 2, and in ver. 3, 4, he was commanded to declare the words of God to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, saying, *Judge betwixt me and my vineyard—What could have been done to my vineyard, that I have not done in it? Wherefore when I looked that it should bring forth grapes, brought it forth wild grapes?* This state of the church he describes till he comes to the verse under consideration. Then referring to the period when God was worshipped among them in the beauty of holiness, he says in the second proposition, שִׂמְחוּ לַפָּנִים *shaamchou lepanekha*, *They have rejoiced in thy presence*, viz. at the altar of God, before the Cherubim; which was always understood to be immediately in the presence of God, because from thence he communicated with his people.

The following comparison concerning the happiness of the people at that period, is then applicable, without rejecting the word לֹא *lo*, i. e. *not*; or of being driven to the subterfuge of the Masoretic commentators, by changing it for לוֹ *lov*, i. e. *to him*. It is perfectly consistent with the grammar of the language, which is not the case in the common version; and it is astonishing how it could escape the notice of the first Hebrew scholars, both Jews and Christians, in all ages since the dispersion of the Hebrews. The verse truly reads, *Thou hast multiplied the nation; thou hast not increased the joy: they have rejoiced in thy presence according to the joy in harvest; accordingly as they exult, when they divide spoil*.

In this last proposition the words, *and men*, are supplied; but there is no necessity for them; the text reads far more proper as the sacred writer has left it.

The specimens I have given in my Prospectus, of the state of the present common version, and which I have proved here to be the true sense of the original, have given great satisfaction to all unbiassed and unprejudiced readers. For no bigot having the use of right reason, can possibly believe in his heart, however he may profess to believe; that the prophet was authorized to grant a *pardon* and an *indulgence* to Naaman to commit sin in future, 2 Kings v. 18; that if *evil be in the city, the Lord hath done it*, Amos iii. 6; that God commanded the prophet to *make the heart of the people fat, their ears heavy, and to shut their eyes, lest they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their hearts, and convert and be healed*, Isa. vi. 10. Who, believing in the Supreme Being, would have the hardihood to say, because it is so said in the common version; *Ah Lord God, surely thou hast greatly deceived this people*, Jer. iv. 10; *O Lord, thou hast deceived me*, ch. xx. 7? I am perfectly confident that no truly learned man, no intelligent man, no man capable of distinguishing between right and wrong, and having the honesty to give his opinion, whether Christian or Jew; will be so impious as to impeach the moral character of the God of mercy, by

declaring him to be such a being as he is represented to be in these and in many other passages in the common version.

These objectors have said nothing on Gen. vii. 14, *Make for thee an ark of Gopher wood: rooms thou shalt make in the ark, and shall pitch it within and without with pitch.* I refer the reader to the note on this passage, where I have shewn that the word rendered *pitch*, has no such meaning; nor does it signify to *cover* in any part of scripture. That the word מִיבַיִת *mibayith*, which should be translated, *even a house*, is omitted; meaning *the house within the vail*. See where the word is so translated, Numb. xviii. 7, *WITHIN THE HOUSE in the vail*.

There is another passage which these objectors have not noticed in the Prospectus, Gen. xxxvii. 3, *Because he was the son of his old age, and he made him a coat of many colours.* I have shewn that the verse is not only unintelligible, but that it has no such signification.

From the above remarks, which I have made in answer to the objections to translations in my Prospectus, the learned reader will see, that "the *grammatical* rules which are said to have been applied to try whether my emendations are correct or not," are *ungrammatical*; and that these writers have yet to acquaint themselves with those branches of Hebrew learning, and even with the choice of proper words in the English language, according to idiom, in order to give the true meaning of the sacred writer in a variety of passages, before they can be allowed to possess that critical acumen which they have so liberally bestowed on themselves.

CONCERNING VERBS WRITTEN IN THE FUTURE FORM, AND TRANSLATED IN THE PRETER TENSE.

We find in the Hebrew scriptures, that verbs written in the future form, prefixed with the ו *vau*, are very frequently translated in the preter tense; the reason for this has been a subject of inquiry for ages. The modern Jews can assign no other reason, than that it is according to the genius of the language: this does not explain it; and therefore I have endeavoured to point out the reason. This investigation has led me to trace the philosophy of language; and in this primæval language, this most ancient of all languages, there is a *science*, a hypothesis, which I have not found explained by any writer, Jew or Christian, since the time of Christ.

Some grammarians, who were not able to assign a better reason, have said, that when the ו *vau*, written with the vowel *Pathach*, is prefixed to a verb written in the future form; that it converts it to the preter tense, or past time: this explains nothing. Besides, I shall prove that the ו *vau*, has nothing to do with converting one tense to another: it is absurd to suppose any thing of the kind; and no one critically acquainted with the language will attempt to assert it, as it is only supposition, and supposition proves nothing. I shall now proceed to develop the system which appears to be regular throughout the scriptures.

When a verb at the beginning of a subject is written in the preter tense, and connected with verbs following which describe an action taking place after the action described by the first verb; such following verbs are written in the *future* form, because the actions described by them are *future* to the action described by the first verb at the beginning of the subject. And they are translated in the *preter*, because the ו *vau* connects the preter tense of the first verb, which is connected with the same order, meaning and application, as is signified by the first verb.

Example. Gen. i. 1, the first verb is בָּרָא *bara*, *he created*, which is connected with וַיֹּמַר *vayomer*,

and he said, in the 3d verse; וַיַּרְא *vayare*, and he saw, וַיַּבְדֵּל *vayabdeel*, and he divided, in the 4th verse; and וַיִּקְרָא *vayikra*, and he called, in the 5th verse; which verbs describe actions after the action described by the first verb: therefore, being actions future to the first *preter*, they are written in the *future* form, and the ו *vau* connects the *preter* tense of the verb בָּרָא *bara*, with every verb, till the subject of these verbs terminates, which is אֹר *aor*, light, or יוֹם *yom*, day, where the stop *Katon* finishes the proposition. This order runs through the whole chapter, every verb introducing a creation of particulars with a reference to the first verb at the beginning of the subject, viz. the creation.

Ch. iii. ver. 17, takes a new subject, which, as above, is introduced by the *preter* of the verb, שָׁמַעְתָּ *shaamangta*, thou hast hearkened, followed by the future form of the verb, וַתֹּאכַל *vatokal*, and thou hast eaten; so as above, the action described is future to the action mentioned in the preceding verb שָׁמַעְתָּ *shaamangta*, thou hast hearkened.

Ch. iv. The first verse begins with the *PRETER*: Now Adam יָדַע *yaadang*, knew, followed by the futures, וַתַּהַר *va tahar*, and she conceived; וַתֵּלֶד *va taled*, and she bare; וַתֹּמַר *va tomer*, and she said. Ver. 2, וַתֹּסֶף *va toseph*, and she added; וַיְהִי *va yehi*, and he was. And the proposition ends at the following word צֶמֶן *tsen*, sheep. The simple *PRETER* again begins at the head of the series, וַהֲיָה *va haayah*, and it was, followed by the future forms וַיְהִי *va yehi*, and it was; וַיָּבֵא *va yaabee*, and he had brought; ver. 3d. Again, ver. 4th, the *PRETER* הֵבִיא *heebia*, he brought, is followed by the *FUTURE* forms וַיִּשָּׁח *va yishang*, and he had respect. Ver. 5th, the *PRETER* שָׁנָה *shaangnah*, he respected, followed by the *FUTURES*, וַיִּחַר *va yichar*, and he was wroth. Ver. 6th, וַיֹּמַר *va yomer*, and he said. Ver. 8th, וַיְהִי *va yehi*, and it came to pass; וַיָּקָם *va yaakaam*, and he rose; וַיַּחַרְגֵּהוּ *va yahargeehou*, and he slew him. Ver. 9th, וַיֹּמַר *va yomer*, and he said, where it meets a *preter* at the beginning of a subject, and the same order follows. The verbs following a *preter* verb describing an action after the action described by the *preter* verb, and therefore describing actions future to the action introduced by the *preter* verb, they are written in the future form, and, as observed, they are translated in the *preter* tense, because the ו *vau* connects the *preter* tense of the first verb.

THE ו *VAU*, WITH THE VOWEL SHEVA, IS NOT CONVERSIVE.

We are told by Hebrew grammarians, that the ו *vau*, (i. e. a conjunction) when written with the vowel *Sheva*, prefixed to verbs in the *preter* tense, converts them to the future tense, or time. That verbs in the *preter* form prefixed with ו *vau*, written with the vowel *Sheva*, are often translated in the future time, is allowed; but it by no means depends on what grammarians call the *vau* *conversive*. For, as I have observed, if this were the case, that the ו *vau*, with *Sheva* prefixed to verbs in the *preter*, converted them to the *future time*; then all verbs in the *preter* form, prefixed with ו *vau*, written with the vowel *Sheva*, should always be converted to the future time. This however is not so, for we find that verbs in the *preter* time, notwithstanding they have the ו *vau* prefixed with the vowel *Sheva*, as frequently retain their *preter* time. See Gen. xxx. 41, וַהֲיָה *vehaayah*, and it came to pass; ch. xlvii. 22; Exod. xxxv. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11; Neh. xii. 39; 1 Sam. ii. 15;—xvi. 23; 2 Kings xiv. 14; Eccles. iv. 4;—viii. 17; Ezek. xxxvii. 8; Dan. xii. 5, &c. &c. And on the contrary, if ו *vau* with *Sheva*, had this converting power, where was the necessity for the verb to be written in the future tense, when this same ו *vau* is prefixed? See Gen. ix. 27, and he shall dwell; Jer. xiv. 10, and he will visit; Hos. viii. 13, and visit; Eccles. xii. 4, and he shall

arise. Writers have framed different theories concerning this *vau*; but it evidently appears that the *vau* with Sheva prefixed either to the preter or future form of a verb, has nothing to do with the tense; and therefore the notion which has for ages been entertained of the existence of the *vau conversive*, falls to the ground.

The same order is preserved here as is shewn concerning the verbs written in the future form, and translated in the preter tense. For when a verb written in the *future tense* at the head of a subject precedes a verb in the *preter tense*, which has the *vau*, prefixed with the vowel Sheva, then the future time of the first verb is connected by the *vau*, and carried to the following verb in the same proposition, though written in the preter form; because it describes an action which takes place future to the verb at the beginning of the subject.

Deut. vii. 10, where the future יִחַדֵּר *yacheer*, *he will (not) be slack*, is connected with the preter form of the verb וְשָׁמַרְתָּ *veshaamarta*, *thou shalt keep*, ver. 11; with וְהָיָה *vehaayah*, *it shall come to pass*, and וְשָׁמַרְתָּ *ve shaamar*, *shalt keep*, ver. 12. Again the future form of the verb וְהָיָה *tihyeh*, is connected with the preter וְהָיָה *veheesir*, *the Lord will remove*, with וְנָתַתָּ *nethaanaam*, *will put*, ver. 15; and וְאָכַלְתָּ *veakala*, *and thou shalt consume*, ver. 16. See the same order through the 22d, 23d, 24th, 25th, and 26th verses. See also the following chapter, ver. 1; וְחַיִּיתָ *tichyom*, *ye may live*, is connected with the preter forms of verbs.

The translators should have been well acquainted with the nature of the *vau*; they have almost uniformly translated it by the conjunction copulative *and*: this has given rise to very serious errors, and always a shocking redundancy; for in the common version of the 1st chapter, it is made to occur above 90 times, when (as observed) it ought not to be so rendered above eleven or twelve times. With different constructions, it is *adverbial*, *explanatory*, *disjunctive*, *negative*, and, according to rule, calls for a different particle. As when any thing is done in succession; *THEN*, *WHERE*, departure from place; *WHENCE*, in a different manner; *OTHERWISE*, when the state of the thing is remaining; *YET*, when the subject relates to time past; *BEFORE*, explanatory; *EVEN*, strong affirmation; *YEA*, when a reason is given; *THEREFORE*, additional; *MOREOVER*, when the thing is repeated; *AGAIN*, in like manner; *SO*, *ALSO*, recapitulation; *LIKEWISE*, &c. &c. Its negative power arises from its connection; for when a negative clause precedes a clause which is connected therewith by the *vau*, then, in like manner, it carries the sense of the negative to the end of the series. See Exod. xx. 10, *Thou nor thy son, nor thy daughter, nor thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor the stranger that is within thy gates.*

But in Deut. viii. 12, there seems to be an exception to this rule, if we depend on the common translation. I therefore caution the Hebrew reader, for the word וְאָכַל *tokal*, is translated as the preter of the verb, viz. *thou hast eaten*; and therefore it may be said the rule fails, as there is no future to be carried to the following verb. But וְאָכַל *tokal*, is not the preter of the verb, as in the common version; it is the future, viz. *thou shalt eat*. See where the same word is truly translated, Exod. xxiii. 11; Lev. xvii. 12, *shall eat*. Then the following verb וְשָׂבַעְתָּ *vesaabangta*, *and be satisfied*, which has the preter form, reads agreeably to the rule, viz. *And thou shalt be satisfied.*

ON THE PLUPERFECT TENSE.

There is another branch of Hebrew learning proper to be noticed here, and which the reader will see is indispensably necessary to obtain the true sense in many parts of scripture; this is the

pluperfect tense, or time of a verb. Those who are not acquainted with the meaning of the term will understand, that the *pluperfect tense* or *time* of a verb, means not only the preter or past time in common, but it expresses a remote *preter* or *past time*, beyond the common preter or past time. As when the common preter refers to any transaction on a certain day, time, or period past, such as *the man went forth, the man declared*; the pluperfect tense carries the mind to the action done more remote, viz. *the man HAD gone forth—the man HAD declared*.

This makes a great difference with regard to a vast number of passages, and in some, the translators and revisors have been impelled to use it, in order to get a consistent sense, though they knew not that there was a rule for it in the language. But in other passages they have used it without any authority, and wherever they have done so, they have gained nothing; the common preter is more proper. The reader, however, will see that this is not a different tense from the perfect, or common preter; it is truly a modification of the preter, carrying the mind to a past period beyond the time or period then spoken of. The rule for the pluperfect does not appear to have been known either by Jews or Christians since the dispersion of the Jewish nation, though it is pointed out in the language, and only required industry to trace out its conformity in every part of scripture.

I have above given some proof concerning the vast importance of the accentual reading, that by it a great many passages in the common versions, where there are obvious contradictions, are reconciled. Its utility is no less with regard to the pluperfect tense, which, as I have observed above, is acknowledged by the learned Bochart to have been so neglected, that neither Jews nor Christians understood it in his day. But it will be seen by the intelligent reader, that as there is a power exercised by man which carries the mind to a period more remote than the first preter, or recent past time; there must be an expression for such a modification of the preter tense as we find in all languages. And therefore it would be absurd to suppose that the Hebrew, the most expressive, the most comprehensive, and the most correct of all languages; the language in which God gave his commands, should be defective in this point. Consequently there must have been some formal method of expressing the existence of this remote preter among the ancient Hebrews.

The rule for the modification of the preter tense, which modification is called the preter pluperfect tense, depends on the accent *pashta*, i. e. *to put off*, which is its meaning. That is, it is so called, because it *puts off* the time of the verb to a time more remote.

I shall now refer the reader to the proofs for the existence of this modification of the preter tense. See Gen. xvi. 5, *that she HAD conceived*; ch. xix. 17, *when they HAD brought them forth*; ch. xxxiii. 19, *he HAD there spread*; ch. xxxv. 7, 14, *For there he HAD repaired the altar, also he HAD preached*; Jacob HAD erected; ver. 15, *Jacob HAD called the name of the place where God HAD spoken with him, Beth-el*. The 29th chapter, ver. 18, 19, will shew that the sacred writer referred to the time when Jacob set up a pillar, when he called the name of the city of Luz, Beth-el, on his journey to the land of Aram, which confirms the certainty of the preter pluperfect tense in the Hebrew. Josh. v. 12, *after they HAD eaten*; ch. viii. 13, *when they HAD set*; ch. x. 1, *HAD taken*; ch. xiv. 3, *for Moses HAD given*; ch. xxi. 5, *for they HAD made a great oath*; Judges, ch. xiv. 18, *if ye HAD not*; Ruth i. 6, *she HAD heard*; 1 Chron. x. 9, *when they HAD stripped*;

1 Kings i. 6, *HAD not displeased*. This first modification of the perfect tense, which carries the mind to a period beyond the common preter, is properly the first aorists of the Hebrew. The second occurs by a repetition of the accent *וַיַּשְׁכַּח* *pashta*, on the verb. See Gen. ii. 18, *And Jehovah God said, It is not good that the man should be alone*; evidently referring to the most remote time, the first state of man, before the creation of Eve. Ch. iv. 1, *she had conceived*, viz. as soon as they were created, i. e. in Eden, agreeably to the divine command. See on ch. iv. 1; again, ch. vi. 7, *I have created*, referring to the first of the human race, the most remote as to person and time. And therefore the aorist is repeated on the verb. Ch. iii. 17, *I commanded thee*. This plainly carries the mind to the state in Eden when God had commanded them, saying, *Thou shalt not eat thereof*. Ch. xlii. 5, *They came*, viz. at the first, or most remote time of their going into Egypt. Ch. xliv. 7, *That be far from thee*; clearly meaning that which was the most remote in the mind of God. Ver. 20, 22, *we said*; that was, at the most remote time, concerning the subject in question, at their first journey. Ver. 21, 23, *Thou saidest*; at the same period. Thus it will be seen that as the Hebrew was the first language, the Greeks must have had their aorists from the Hebrew.

I have endeavoured to lay before the reader these important branches of the sacred language; not because they have not heretofore been known, for the arrangement of the preter and the future verb at the head of a subject, carrying the actions by the *vau*, which is always conjunctive, to the following verbs to the end of the series, and the accentual modification of the preter tense for the pluperfect; are regular throughout the scripture. And it appears that the ancient Hebrews in the time of Ezra were well acquainted with these branches of Hebrew learning. But it is certain that they have been totally neglected since the dispersion of the Hebrews, as has been acknowledged by the learned in the different nations of Europe; no writer, no grammarian, either Jew or Christian, since that period, having attempted to give us a solution of these lingual problems concerning this peculiar construction of the language.

Many things in the following pages will appear new; yet they will be found perfectly consistent with the meaning of the sacred writer. I again remind the Reader, to remember that the present authorized version, and all the national versions of Europe, were translated from the Latin Vulgate; and thus all the errors made in the early ages of the Christian church, have been perpetuated. Infallibility cannot be the exclusive privilege of the fourth century; therefore it will appear to the intelligent reader, as it has to those eminent men I have referred to, that in those days when the Hebrew language was so imperfectly known to Christians, errors must have been made. From this consideration, and from the manifest errors of those who have attempted to find fault with some translations in my Prospectus, before they have seen the reasons for deviating from the authorized version; errors, in neither understanding the propositions in a verse, nor the various applications of words in our language according to idiom; I recommend the impartial searcher for truth, attentively to read and *understand* what I have advanced in this Introduction, and what is said at large in the notes to the work; before he concludes that the sacred writer was commanded to communicate absurdities; or ventures impiously to assert, that the God of mercy consistently with his infinite perfections, could give commands in direct opposition to his moral justice: to *lay stumbling-blocks before the people, that they should fall, and perish*, Jer. vi. 21; or, that the prophet was commanded to *make the heart of the people fat, and to shut their eyes, lest they should be converted*, Isa. vi. 10.

THE FIRST BOOK OF MOSES,

CALLED

GENESIS.

CHAP. I.

IN the beginning God created, the substance of the heaven, and the substance of the earth.

NOTES ON CHAPTER I.

Verse 1.—*In the beginning*, בְּרֵאשִׁית, *Bereeshith*. This word has been variously interpreted. Grotius has ventured to render it thus; *WHEN FIRST*—*Simoon*, *BEFORE*. But as this idea gave rise to the pagan doctrine of the eternity of matter, and there being no authority for it in the Hebrew, it has been justly rejected by all sound critics. The Jerusalem Targum, IN WISDOM—Tertullian, IN POWER—Philo, Rabbi Bechai, and Castalio, IN ORDER, BEFORE ALL: and Maimonides, WITH MATTER. Onkelos, the Septuagint, and Jonathan Ben Uziel, have very properly been followed by the European translators, who have given the word its true radical meaning; IN THE BEGINNING.

The Scripture must necessarily be its own interpreter, and therefore, in order to silence the assertions of those who plead for the atheistical notion of the eternity of matter, we are informed, in the sacred page, that God created the very substance of the heaven and the earth; that is, the matter, including the elements of matter. Psalm cii. 25. *Of old hast thou laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thy hands*. Prov. viii. 23, 24. *I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, before the earth was. When there were no depths I was brought forth; when there were no fountains abounding with water*. This is a sufficient answer to all those who have said, that there was an eternal chaos, or deep, or mass, of crude matter, out of which God created the heaven and the earth. For we find that the pre-existence both of matter, and chaos, or the deep; are rejected by the inspired writers. It appears therefore that God was the creator of the very materials, or matter of which he formed all things.

God, אֱלֹהִים, *Elohyim*.—Many writers and commentators have said that this is a plural noun; viz. that it is literally Gods. If this were true, the passage would run thus: *In the beginning Gods created the heaven and the earth*. There is another consideration which makes decidedly against this interpretation; this word is the nominative to the verb בָּרָא, *bara*, which is the third person singular preter, *he created*; and it must be allowed, that a plural noun cannot be con-

2 Now the earth was without form, even a waste; also darkness was upon the face of the deep; but the spirit of God moved, upon the face of the waters.

nected with a verb singular: we cannot say, *Gods, he created*. Ideas are the same among all people, and have a corresponding conformity in all languages; therefore it must of necessity follow, that *Elohyim* is a noun singular, and that our translators who have followed the most approved Doctors among the ancient Hebrews before Christ, as well as the writers in the apostolic church to the time of the council of Nice, 325 years after Christ; are perfectly right in translating the first preposition as it stands in the received translation.

This word could not possibly be understood by them in any other sense; for as *Elohyim, God*, is the nominative to the verb בָּרָא, *bara*, *he created*; whatever plurality there may be in the Deity, there can but be ONE CREATOR, ONE GOD. Whatever multiplicity, or variety there may be in the going forth of the divine idea in formative power, he is one UNDIVIDED SUBSTANCE; the SOURCE OF ALL INTELLIGENCE—THE POWER OF ALL POWERS—THE CREATOR OF ALL MATTER: who by his CREATIVE EFFLUX gave being and form to all things; instant to sensible creation, and understanding to man.

There is one consideration which will relieve the mind as to this particular, and which commentators have passed over in silence, when they have attempted to define the word אֱלֹהִים, *Elohyim*. These writers in general seem to have forgotten that God possesses an attribute, of which it is impossible for man to form any adequate idea! viz. *UNIQUITY, OMNIPRESENCE*, i. e. *PRESENCE AT ALL TIMES IN ALL PLACES*! Notwithstanding, it must be understood that though it strikes the finite mind with an idea of plurality, yet as it respects the infinite, it is one and indivisible in himself. Like the beams of the sun, which at the same moment are felt in all places; so by his *UNIQUITY*, his divine energies, are operating at the same time in all places. Therefore אֱלֹהִים, *Elohyim*—*God*, as descriptive of his plurality, can no more be considered as a plural noun, on this account, than the sun can be considered as a plural noun, because he operates in all places at the same time.

Others again have thought that the word *Elohyim*, is a

3 Then God said, BE LIGHT: and LIGHT WAS.

4 And God saw, that the light, was good: thus God divided, the light, from the darkness.

plural noun, having a plural termination. But it cannot be admitted that *elohim*, forms the plural of the noun *Elohyim*; for many nouns have this termination which are nouns singular, as *mitsrayim*, Egypt: *shaamayim*, heaven, *panim gual panim*, face to face. *teraphim*, an image. 1 Sam. xix. 13.

The *teraphim*, which Michal prepared, and put into the bed to represent David, was absolutely a complete image of a man, of ONE MAN and no more; which could not have been the case if *elohim*, had formed the plural; it must then have been images. So that the remark made by those who have said that *Elohyim*, God, is plural when applied to an image; but singular when applied to God: is in direct opposition to scripture, reason, and the common use of the word. *Elohyim* is frequently joined with adjectives plural, because *elohim*, *Elohyim*, being the absolute form, refers to the sovereignty of God over all the works of his hand. But as I have shown, it is also throughout the scriptures, connected with pronouns singular. Also *Mitsrayim*, i. e. Egypt: though it has the termination *im*, *ym*, is connected with pronouns singular. Josh. xxiv. 7, &c.

Another proof which is as conclusive as the above, we find, Deut. xiv. 6, *reechayim*, the nether milstone. Surely no one will contend that the word which means, the nether milstone, is plural; because the word *raakeb*, the upper milstone, with which it is connected, must have had the same termination. This the translators were aware of, and have therefore translated it properly, as a noun singular.

If we turn to the greatest authorities among the ancient Hebrews, we shall find that they understood the word, *elohim*, to be a noun singular. Jonathan the paraphrast translates the word as a noun singular by, 'an angel of the Lord'—and after him the learned Rabbi Kimchi, by a great man. Thus we find that these writers, who, on account of their living when the language was better understood than it is at this day, and who must have perfectly known the true meaning of the word, have translated it as a NOUN SINGULAR.

Many commentators have thought that this word was derived from the Arabic, *Allah*, God; but this cannot be admitted; for the Hebrew is not the derived, but the primitive language; Gen. xi. 1. *All the earth was of one language, and of one speech.* Others again have supposed that the word *Elohyim* is derived from a root in the language; but the word which describes God, can no more be derived from another word, than God himself derives his existence from another being. It is a compound word, from *el*, *Jah*, THE ESSENCE, and *el*, *power*; and it means the manifestation of the attributes of Deity by his almighty power. These together form the word *elohim*, *Elohea*, which has the same meaning as *elohim*, and in which form, viz. *elohim*, *Elohea*, God; it regularly occurs in regimini, throughout the scripture; as *elohim* Jacob, God of Jacob; *elohim* Israel, God of Israel; *elohim* Shaamayim, God of heaven. And when the *el*, *essence*, is added, it forms the absolute or positive; by which it is distinguished from *elohim*, *Elohea*, the relative; according to the most eminent grammarians and doctors among the ancient Jews.

It is for this reason, as is observed by Abarbanal, and other Rabbies, both ancient and modern; that the words *elohim*, *Jehovah*, and *elohim* *Elohyim*, God; as they are always to be

5 And God called the light day; and the darkness, he called night: so the evening and the morning, were the first day.

met with, either together or separate, when any command or prophecy is given, and never any of the other names of God; therefore that the first signifies his essence: the other his influence, or external manifestation. From what has been said on this most important word, there cannot be any doubt that *Jehovah* means, the UNSEARCHABLE, and INCOMMUNICABLE attributes of Deity.

Elohyim is said by some writers to be connected with adjectives, nouns, and pronouns plural; and therefore that it must be plural. I shall turn to a few passages in order to prove that this is not the case. Psalm lviii. 12, *Verily he is elohim*, *Elohyim shophim*, a God that judgeth. 2 Sam. vii. 23, *halkou Elohyim Aphdath*, God went to redeem. Ver. 28, *attah hou ha Elohyim*, thou art *ha*, that God. In this last passage we find that the word *Elohyim* is connected with the pronoun of the third person singular, *he*; and therefore must be singular also. But in the other passages, if *Elohyim* were a noun plural, they must be rendered thus; Gods that judgeth—Gods went to redeem. Josh. xxiv. 19, *Elohyim kedshim*, a holy Gods. Gen. xxxi. 53, *Elohea Abraham ve Elohea Nahor*, the Gods of Abraham, the Gods of Nahor. The same order is observed by the sacred writers throughout the scriptures. It is never said, *hachou Elohyim*, and Gods said; but *hachou*, *vayomer*, and God said—God saw—God made.—Psalm c. 8, *Know ye that the Lord he is God, it is he that hath made us, and not we ourselves, we are his people and the sheep of his pasture.* The pronoun of the third person singular, *hou*, *elohim*, *he is God*—*hou gnaasaron*, *he hath made us*: and the pronoun possessive *gnaamo*, *his people*, *marginio*, *his pasture*, regularly occur in connection. But if *Elohyim* had been a plural noun, these pronouns must necessarily have been plural also; and the passage must in such case have been translated thus—Know ye that the Lords THEY are Gods; it is THEY that hath made us, and not we ourselves, we are THEIR people and the sheep of THEIR pasture.

There is one passage in which the word *Elohyim* has been improperly rendered by the translators. 1 Sam. xxviii. 14, 15, *And the king said unto her, Be not afraid; for what seest thou? and the woman said unto him, I saw elohim*, *Elohyim*, *Gods ascending out of the earth.* *And he said unto her, what form is *hou*, he of? and she said, an old man cometh up; and *hou*, he is covered with a mantle.* Here again the pronoun possessive *hou*, *his form*, and the pronoun of the third person singular *hou*, *he is covered*; are connected with *Elohyim*; which shows that this word in the above passage is singular, and not plural, as in the received translations. The noun *Elohyim* is further proved to be a noun singular, and that the king had no idea of its being plural, in the answer she gives to his inquiry: *and she said* *ish zaakeen*, AN OLD MAN cometh up. Hence it appears that this word was used by all the sacred writers as a noun singular, in opposition to the polytheism of that day, which had spread over all the eastern nations: and therefore the sacred writer was instructed to say, *שמע ישראל יהוה אחד*, *Shema Yisrael, Jehovah Eloheenu*, *Jehovah echad*; *hear, Israel: Jehovah our God, Jehovah is one.* And it is remarkable, that the last letter of the first and of the last word in this verse form *gual*. The Eternal.

6 ¶ Then God said; Be there an expanse, in the midst of the waters: and be there a division, between the waters, over the waters.

7 So God made the expanse; also he di-

The manifest error made by those who have pleaded for the plurality of *Elohyim*, God, is; that they have not observed the distinction between POLYTHEISM, and PERSONALITY. By polytheism must necessarily be understood a plurality of gods; but by personality, consistently with the obvious meaning of the word, no such idea as a plurality of gods can be formed in the mind. This error has been confirmed by the very improper understanding and customary application of the Latin word *persona*.

When the Latin was a living language, the word *persona*, from which comes the English word *person*; was understood to mean a *character*, or *office*: but it has so far degenerated into tangible materiality, that instead of its being used as it was anciently, it is applied to mean the material body of man. That it was originally used to signify a *character*, is confirmed by the following authorities: *Sustineo unus tres personas, meam, adversarii, Judicis*; *Cic.—Persona tragica*; *Phœdr.—Euripetetur persona manet res*; *Lucr.—Cereæ persona*; *ibid.*

Some writers have said, that "the deficient roots in the Hebrew are to be sought for in the Arabic language." This would be a very dangerous principle to act upon. Suppose a person who understood a little Arabic, and had but a trifling knowledge of the elements of the Hebrew, but meeting with words in that language, the meaning of which he could not ascertain, were to incorporate with the Hebrew such words from the Arabic, as he thought would elucidate the passage; we might soon have the Bible crowded with Arabic words and meanings. So that the Syriac, Samaritan, Coptic, Ethiopic, and even all the languages of the east; might, on this principle, be called in, to aid us, in obtaining a knowledge of the will of God, as revealed to man in the original Hebrew.

I have said that there can be no doubt as to the priority of the Hebrew language; for the Hebrews descended lineally from Shem, the father of the children of Eber, from whom they were called *Ebrians*, or *Hebrews*; and since the dispersion they have remained a distinct people, and the Hebrew a distinct language, in which they write, and celebrate their religious rites. So far the Hebrew is a living language, though the Jews are at present in a state of non-existence as a nation; but the Hebrew language is no more lost than it was during their captivity in Babylon, 600 years before Christ. Almost all the ancient prophane writers give testimony to the priority of the Hebrew language; it appears that it was the language of ancient Egypt; when the sons of Jacob went there, the natives spake it; and when they came to Joseph, they were understood, for it does not appear that he spake to them by an interpreter. *חַמְצִיץ*, *hametzitz*, does not mean an interpreter, as will be shewn in its place. Now, when there are so many living testimonies in all nations, which confirm the antiquity and descent of this language in regular historical succession, as contained in the Bible, and in all the voluminous Rabbinical writings; it is wonderful that a supposition of this nature could be entertained by intelligent men.

Modern commentators have said; "If, for example, we meet with a term in our English language, the meaning of which we find difficult to ascertain; common sense teaches us that we should seek for it in the Anglo-Saxon, from which our lan-

guage springs; no person disputes the legitimacy of this measure." This is admitted, as far as it is applicable to the English, which springs from the Anglo-Saxon; but this reasoning cannot be allowed as applicable to the Hebrew. The same common sense teaches us, that as the Hebrew did not spring from any other language, no other can be resorted to for an elucidation of this primeval language, whose very root is in nature. It must appear evident, that no comparison can be made as to the infinitude of expression, between the Hebrew language, which has thirteen vowels for the variation of sense, and the certainty of application; and a great number of pauses, for giving force to words and sentences, marking *rapidity*, *slowness*, *gravity*, *love*, *anger*, &c.: and the Arabic, which has properly but three vowels. The Hebrew, on account of its number of vowels, necessarily becomes one of the most comprehensive of all languages.

It has been asserted by many writers, that the "Hebrew language is lost except what is in the Bible;" but we might as well affirm that the Arabic has been lost; for pure Arabic is no more spoken either in Arabia, or Turkey, than the pure Hebrew is among the Jews. The Koran, which is written in Arabic, is esteemed to be the holy language by the Arabians and Turks; as the Hebrew is by the Jews and Christians: and commentators ought to have known that the Hebrew writers are far more numerous, and their writings, now extant, far more voluminous than those of the Greeks, or Romans: how then can it be said that the Hebrew language is lost, except what is in the Bible?

It is a mere delusion to attempt, through the cognate languages, or dialects, to elucidate the Hebrew, from which all languages had their origin; as has been asserted by some commentators. The learned Doctor Pococke, who is allowed to have been the best Arabic scholar that ever Europe produced, and who, on account of his knowledge of that language, was permitted to read some of the choice MSS. in the Emperor's library at Constantinople, says; that he never could get any information from the Arabic, which could enable him to elucidate any part of the sacred writings.

It is altogether unnecessary, and perhaps impossible, to show at what period of the world, the Arabic language took its rise; the only date we have to guide us through the mazes of antiquity, is; when what is called the confusion of tongues took place. But it is absolutely necessary for us to know, that prior to this period, there was but one language, and that this was the Hebrew. It is expressly said, Gen. x. 11, two thousand years after the fall; *And the beginning of his kingdom was Babel*; this was at the commencement of the Babylonish, or Chaldean Empire. And the first verse of the following chapter says; *and the whole earth was of one language*. This one language was the ancient Hebrew, which had been handed down to them from Adam, and thus it passed through all the ages of the first patriarchs to the time of Noah; from him by the second order of patriarchs to the time of Abraham; and from him to the establishment of the government by Moses.

When these remarks are duly attended to, I hope no writer will feel himself justified in depreciating the *authority*, *genuineness*, or *antiquity* of the Hebrew language, by endeavouring to show that it springs from the Arabic or any other

8 Then God called the expanse, heaven: so the evening, and the morning, were the second day.

language; for as it is impossible that this should be the case; it is doing much injury to the present generation and to posterity, by inculcating doubts, as to the antiquity of the original Hebrew, which would finally lead to a rejection of the text, as to its authority and absolute integrity.

Some may suppose that this is the same as the doctrine of Sabellius; but the intelligent reader will do well to observe, that Sabellius taught the personification of the *esse*, or the essential principles of Deity; which is impossible; for man who is finite can never draw near to the fount of the infinite, but by the medium of the abointed one, the Messiah.

The next word in the second proposition in this verse is *eth*, which in all the translations is twice omitted in this verse. Some translators have thought it to be a mark of the accusative case simply, after an active verb; but if so, there must be a repetition of the article *the*; as the following word *shamayim*, heaven, has the emphatic prefix *ha*, *the*; by which it is to be translated, *the heaven*. I say if this word *eth*, comprehends no more than simply the accusative, there must either be a repetition of the article *the*, and so *eth hashamayim*, must be translated, *the, the heaven*; or the word *eth*, must be passed over without being translated, as it is in the translations. But if this word be translated, it will add consistency to the narrative, and removes an old objection. It is said, that "the historian contradicts himself; as he says, the heaven and the earth were created and finished, and afterwards, that it was without form and void, and that darkness was upon the face of the deep, until God said, let there be light. First, that there was a completion of the whole, both of the heaven and the earth; and then that there was nothing but chaotic darkness, and primal matter. Certainly the present translations carry this sense; but this has arisen from the rejection of the word *eth*. This word is composed of the first and last letters of the alphabet, the *aleph*, and *tau*; which have the same meaning as the Greek *alpha*, and *omega*; the *alpha* was *first*, the *first* and the *last*: in one mass, comprehending in itself all the principles necessary for the production of all things. Briefly, it signifies the very substance of the thing spoken of; the *karub*, *inmost*, generative properties, as well as the visible matter; agreeably to the Syriac, the *esse celi et esse terre*.

Thus the word *eth*, ought to be so translated, where the idiom of the European languages will admit of it, as it always greatly elucidates the subject, by giving us the true meaning of the original Hebrew. This was the understanding of the ancient Hebrews before Christ, as may be seen in the writings of Origen, whose paraphrase has always been held in the highest estimation by them. He says, "In the beginning of all created being, motion, and time, within the compass of the first week; GOD, the only adorable one, Created, made out of nothing, by INFINITE POWER, and INFINITE WISDOM, this Heaven, and this Earth, and the vast number of extended spheres." The clause reads, *the substance of the heaven, and the substance of the earth*. So that by the creation of the heaven and the earth are to be understood the production of the matter out of which all things were formed in the universe, by the coming forth of the essential creative power of Deity.

Another objection to the Mosaic account of the creation, has been grounded on the common version. It has been said, that "the narrative contradicts itself; as the sun is declared to

9 ¶ Now God said, The waters shall continue from under the heaven, in one place; for the dry land, shall appear: and it was so.

have been created three days after the creation of light." Origen says, "What rational man can suppose, that the first, second, and third days, and the evenings and mornings, passed without the sun, moon, and stars; and the first day without the heaven." Orig. Philocal. c. i. p. 12. But it will appear evident on reflection, that when God sent forth light, he embodied it in the glorious luminary, the sun. The creation of the sun cannot be understood to have been three days after the creation of light; for as it was appointed to divide the light from the darkness, and as three days and three nights had been produced by this divider of the light from the darkness; there can be no doubt but that the concentrated body of light which God spake into existence when he illuminated the mass of matter, was the sun; which, agreeably to the divine direction, had caused this division for the first three days and nights of the creation. Thus it appears that the sacred penman, in the 14th, 15th, 16th, 17th, and 18th verses, speaks of the office of the luminary which God had made, viz. that it was to rule the day; to divide the day from the night, and for signs and for seasons, and for days and years.

2. And the Spirit of God moved. There are in this verse, in the translation, no less than four conjunctions copulative, where the *vau*, is translated by the word *and*; which ought not to have been done in any one instance. It runs thus; AND the earth was without form AND void, AND darkness was upon the face of the deep, AND the spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters. In the first and second propositions, which end at *tehom*, the deep; there are three conjunctions copulative, but every conjunction copulative, whether in subject or predicate, must make two propositions; therefore the first word, *earth*, cannot be introduced by a conjunction copulative, as in the common version. Time had now begun its appointed round; the *gueret*, evening, was now progressively going on to introduce the first morning; therefore the first word, *vau*, should be rendered by the adverb of time, *then*, at that time, viz. then the earth. The second error is at *bohou*, void, where the first proposition ends; but here the *vau*, is exegetical or explanatory; because it is connected with the subject introduced, the earth; and should be translated by the adverb *even*, viz. even a void, or, waste.

The second proposition begins at *vechashke*, and darkness; but the conjunction should be adverbial, because the thing mentioned is of the same description as the then existing state of the earth, viz. chaotic darkness; therefore it requires a conjunction which defines the thing spoken of to be in the same comparative state, and should be translated by the word *also*, i. e. in like manner, viz. also darkness.

The last clause says, and the spirit of God moved upon the face of the water. Now when God had created the substance of the heaven and the earth, the earth was a waste, a desolation, and would have remained in this state, but for his all-creative influence. The *vau*, therefore, calls for a conjunction conveying an idea of opposition to those states which preceded; for the earth was in a state of darkness, confusion, and disorder; but by the enlivening power of their opposite, order was brought forth. Therefore the grammatical construction, and the proper accent, *Athnah*, at the end of the preceding proposition, show that a conjunction adversative, must be chosen. So that the *vau*, prefixed to *vechashke*, which is translated,

10 And God called, the dry land, earth; but the conflux of the waters, he called seas: and God saw, that it was good.

11 Then God said, the earth shall germinate, grass; the herb yielding seed; fruit-tree, yielding fruit after his kind; with its seed in it, upon the earth: and it was so.

12 So the earth brought forth grass, the

herb, yielding seed after its kind; and the tree yielding fruit, with its seed in it, after its kind: and God saw that it was good.

13 So the evening, and the morning, were the third day.

14 ¶ Now God said, Be there lights, in the expanse of the heaven; to cause a division, between the day, and between the night: thus they

AND the spirit: should be, but the spirit. Thus far the passage truly reads, as in the new translation.

The word *merachepeth*, is translated, *moved*, in the common version, viz. *the spirit of God moved*. The translators have mistaken the conjugation, they have rendered it in *Kal*, whereas it is in the *Hipil* conjugation, which means to *cause* the thing to be done; that is, to cause the work of creation to be accomplished by the going forth of the divine influence. This adds a great dignity to the holy proceeding, as it removes the idea of a particular locality of the spirit, or essential attributes of Deity; which is too apparent in the translation.

The *vau*, occurs ninety-two times in this chapter, in all which, the translators have rendered it by the conjunction copulative *and*. But they ought to have known, that the *vau*, has different modes of expression, according to construction, even as various as the conjunctions in our language. The rule for the choice of the corresponding conjunctions in other languages cannot be mistaken by those who understand the Hebrew.

3. *Let there be light, and there was light.* I refer the reader to the note on the 26th verse, where I have shown that the word *let* is improper as to language—that it cannot be used as spoken by the Creator—and that there is no authority for it in these verses in the Hebrew.

In the last clause of this verse, *va yehi aour*, which is translated, *and there was light*; the word *there*, is supplied. So that the sublimity of the original is, in a great measure, lost; when God spake, it was done—the irresistible energies of his creative power manifested his will—the clause is worthy of God, and literally reads thus—*Be light: and light was.*

From what has been said, and from what follows, it will appear evident that the sun was created on the first day, and not on the fourth, as has been supposed by most commentators; and that when God spake the creative word, his powerful influence produced *eth ha'aur*, the substance of the light, or the body of the sun. For the *eth*, which means the very substance of the thing spoken of, is not noticed in the common version.

This was evidently the meaning of the sacred writer, otherwise he would not have written the *ha*, prefixed to *aur*, *aur*, the light. The word *aur*, means the light, Gen. xi. 31—*me' aur*, from *Ur*, viz. from the city of *Ur*; a name given to that place, because they worshipped images representative of the heat and light of the sun; as being the most beneficial to man. Isaiah xlv. 16, *I have seen aur*, *aur*, the fire. Here the same word is rendered *fire*, which in ch. i. 3, is translated *light*; but it is certain that it means the light of the sun, as it is put in opposition to *esh*, *fire*; in the same verse. It means to flow, and is applied to the light which flows from the sun, accompanied by heat; it has the same meaning as *ayow*, *Shemesh*, the light, in conjunction with *aur*, *chamaah*, the heat; which the translators have rendered

the sun. Therefore the above word *aur*, means the heat combined with light. So that it was evidently applied to signify the beams of light issuing from the body of the solar orb, containing heat.

4. *And God divided the light from the darkness.* Thus the evening and the morning were the first day, the first day of the seven, and the first of the world. The word *yon*, is used to signify a day; it means the inconceivable motion of the light in passing from the sun, and comprehends the idea of the influence it exercises, directly or indirectly, upon the atmosphere. This division is effected by the diurnal revolution of the earth, which being an opaque body, is illuminated only on the side next the sun.

6. *Then God said, let there be a firmament.* The common version has followed the Septuagint, who have rendered *prothos*, *firmamentum*, and the vulgate, *firmamentum*; but this does not give the true sense of the word. It means expansion; the expanse; and comes from the root *pari*, *rahang*, to spread, like a tent or canopy. It here means the visible heaven, comprehending the solar system, and the vast region of the fixed stars.

12. *Yehi aur*, *yielding seed*. The Hebrew is singularly expressive; the first word is the participle active in *Hipil*, causing seed of seed; having the generative principles inherent in its own prolific root; so as to enable it to multiply in such an astonishing manner, that in the space of a few years, one seed would produce as many trees as would fill the whole earth!

14. The word *yehi*, is translated, *let there be*. In this and in the following verse, it has reference to the *aur*, *aur*, or *sun-light*; which was created on the first day. The verb reads, *be*, or *endure*. I have chosen the latter word, for though, to *be*, and to *endure*, have the same meaning; the latter word appears to be more consistent with the intention of the sacred writer; who was here, not only informing us that the lights were to *be* in the expanse of the heaven, but that they were to *endure*. See Ps. lxxii. 17, where the same word is necessarily rendered, *shall endure*.

It is also necessary to observe, that *veha'ayow*, translated in the 15th and 16th verses, *and let them be*; cannot be rendered by the oblique case of *they*, as it does not occur in the word. These words, in the common version, convey an idea that on the fourth day, God created the two great lights, the sun and moon; also, in the 14th verse, the word *vayomer*, *and he said*, conveys a similar idea. This has induced many to assert, that the Mosaic account of the creation is not consistent; as the historian says, that light was created on the first day, and yet that the sun, from whence the light comes, was not created till the fourth day. It should have occurred to commentators, that the two verbs, in these verses, are connected with the remote preter, or pluperfect tense of the verb *vayikra*, *he had called*; where we are informed, in the 5th verse, after this subject, the light had been introduced in the 3d verse; that God HAD called the light day. The

shall endure for signs, and for seasons; also for days, and years.

15 So they shall endure for lights, in the expanse of the heaven; to cause light, upon the earth: and it was so.

16 Thus God made, the two great lights: the greater light, to rule the day; and the lesser light, to rule the night; also the stars.

17 Then God arranged them, in the expanse of the heaven: for the light upon the earth.

18 Even to rule over day, and over night; also to cause a division between the light, and between the darkness: and God saw, that it was good.

19 So the evening, and the morning, were the fourth day.

20 ¶ Then God said; The waters shall bring forth abundantly, the soul of life: and bird shall fly over the earth; upon the face of the expanse of the heaven.

21 Also God created the great animals: and every creature of life, that moveth, which the

waters brought forth after their kind, also every winged bird after his kind; and God saw, that it was good.

22 And God blessed them, saying: Be ye fruitful and multiply, yea fill ye the waters in the seas; also the bird shall multiply on the earth.

23 So the evening, and the morning, were the fifth day.

24 ¶ Then God said, The earth shall bring forth the creature of life, after his kind; cattle and reptile, also the wild beast of the earth, after his kind: and it was so.

25 Thus God made, the wild beast of the earth after his kind, and the cattle after his kind; also every reptile of the ground, after his kind: and God saw, that it was good.

26 Moreover God said; We will make man, in our image, after our likeness: and they shall rule over the fish of the sea and over the bird of the heaven, also over cattle, and over all the earth; even over every reptile that creepeth upon the earth.

remote preter also falls on *לָמַד*, *hagaadul*, GREAT, and *קָטָן*, *hakatun*, LESSER LIGHT, in the 16th verse; signifying, that the sun and the moon had been created, prior to the period mentioned in this verse.

The word *אור*, *owr*, in the third verse, rendered light, means the heat, and consequent light of, the sun; it was the most ancient word for the sun, as used and understood by the Chaldeans before the time of Abraham. It comprehends what is conveyed in the words *אור*, *shemesh*, the light, and *חַמָּה*, *chamaah*, the heat of the sun, as observed; therefore the historian, by using a word which can only be applied to that luminary, as sending forth the heat and light, obviously meant that God created the sun on the first day.

I shall now refer the reader to the fact which the sacred writer has recorded, and which will prove, that the sun and the moon were created on the first day. In the 14th, 16th, and 18th verses, it is said, that God made the two great lights, to divide the day from the night, and that he set them in the firmament of the heaven, to divide the day from the night. This was the order in the work of creation; the light was, by this luminary, the sun, divided from the darkness, on the evening of the first day of the creation. And in full confirmation of this, it is said, in the account of the first day's creation; and God divided the light from the darkness. Now as God created the two great lights, and set them in the expanse of the heaven, to rule the day and the night, or to divide the light from the darkness; and as the light and the darkness had been divided three days and three nights; it must follow that light and darkness had been divided by these two great agents in nature, the sun and the moon, during the first three days of creation.

He made the stars also. This is a distinct clause; the historian gives us an account, in these words, of a work far greater than that of the creation of the sun and moon; viz. the creation of all the worlds in the universe. The words *he made* are not in the original in this clause; but, nevertheless, the

common version is perfectly right, as the accents show that the verb is understood. The sacred writer is here giving an account of the whole furniture of the heaven, distinct from the sun and moon, to inform mankind, that not only these, but the whole host of heaven, were created by Jehovah.

20. *The moving creature that hath life.* The moving creature must necessarily have life; from which it appears that this translation cannot be right: neither is it necessary to say, *fowl that may fly*. There is not any word in the original for moving, nor for the words *that hath*. *יָנוּק*, *Yagnopheeph*, cannot be rendered, *that may fly*; there is no subjunctive mood in Hebrew.

21. *אֲרָמָה*, *hathananim*, in the common version, is rendered *whales*; the *לxx*. *Opimus*; the Vulgate, *plangent*. It means any great animal that makes a mournful sound; the sacred writers used it in this sense. Job. xxi. 28, *I went mourning without the sun, I am a brother to dragons, and a companion to owls*. That is, he went mourning in the night, at which time, owls and the great wild beast come out. Mich. i. 8, *I will make a wailing like the dragons, and mourning as the owls*. Mal. i. 8. By which it is understood that this word was used as a general term, being applied to the great land animals, as well as to those great fish, which make a mournful noise. Most commentators have confined it to the whale, while others have thought it was applied to some other great fish; but this is an error, which is proved by the above references to scripture.

26. *Let us make man.* The word *נַעֲמָשׁ*, *naengash*, is here translated, *let us make*; but in all the scripture, where this word occurs, amounting to a great number, it is rendered by the first person plural, *we*: except, I believe, Josh. xxi. 26, where it should have been translated, *we will prepare*.

The word *let*, in this, and in other places of scripture, is very improperly incorporated in the text. I say improperly, for the best of reasons, viz. because there is not any authority for it in the original. Besides, the application of this word is

27 Then God created, the man in his image; in the image of God, he created him: male and female, he created them.

28 Moreover God blessed them; and God said to them, Be ye fruitful, and multiply ye, yea fill ye the earth, and subdue it: and rule ye over the fish of the sea, and over the bird of the heaven; also over every beast, that moveth upon the earth.

decidedly wrong, agreeably to the grammar of the English language; for when the word *let*, means to *permit*, or *give leave*; it is in the *preter* and *participle passive*. When it is before the third person singular, or plural, *let*, implies *permission*. When it is before the first person plural, *let*, implies *exhortation*. But *permission*, or *exhortation*, cannot be applied to the Creator; when he willed, and sent forth his plastic energies to create man! who was there that could stop the efflux of his Almighty power? Therefore, *permission* and *exhortation* were out of the question—Every word was attended with irresistible power, to manifest his uncontrollable will—he spake, and it was—he commanded, and it stood.

It must necessarily be allowed that there is a plurality in the Divine Nature, for this is undeniably evident throughout the scripture. And I have shown, on verse 1, that whatever plurality there may be in the Deity, there is but one Creator—one God; therefore, it must necessarily be a plurality which is consistent with an essence, SELF-EXISTENT—INFINITE—ETERNAL—and UNCREATE—INDIVISIBLE—and INCOMMUNICABLE.

It cannot, however, be supposed, that God had dwelt in eternal solitude—that he had inhabited eternity in silence, till within the short period of five or six thousand years. We find throughout the scriptures that the divine goodness is continually going forth, not to make himself, but his creatures happy; he who is infinite love itself, must necessarily, in that divine principle, have been going forth in the eternal mansions, to bless the work of his hand. And in conformity with this rational and dignified view of God, we find that we are not left to stumble on the dark mountains of uncertainty; the sacred record, to which I always appeal for proof, is conclusive. Job xxxviii. 4—7: *Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth—when the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy?*

Should any one pretend to say that the above passage in the book of Job is figurative, I would ask; Is it a figure to say that God laid the foundations of the earth? that the singing, or harmonious order of the heavenly bodies, was a figure of ideal things, which had no existence? All writers are justified in such modes of expression. But can any one for a moment suppose, that the clause; *and all the sons of God shouted for joy*, is figurative? then, indeed, there would be no dependence on the language of scripture. All these were literal facts, which cannot be figured away by all the sophistry of infidelity.

Some infidel writers have declared the book of Job to be a fiction; saying, "those regulators of time, the chronologists, appear to have been at a loss where to place, and how to dispose of the book of Job; for it contains no one historical circumstance, nor allusion to any, that might serve to determine its place in the Bible." But the reader may be convinced that such assertions are not supported in truth. If we turn to the

29 Moreover, God said, Behold, I have given to you even every herb, bearing seed, which is upon the face of all the earth; and every tree, in which is the fruit of a tree, yielding seed: to you it shall be, for food.

30 And to every beast of the earth, also to every bird of the heaven, yea to all moving on the earth, in which is the soul of life; even every green herb, for food: and it was so.

36th chapter of Genesis, we shall find an account of the friends of Job, as they are mentioned in the book of Job, viz. Eliphaz, the Temanite; Bildad, the Shuite; Zophar, the Naamathite; and Elihu, the Buzite. Bildad, the Shuite, had his name from Shuah, a son of Abraham, by Keturah—Zophar, the Naamathite, was of Naamah, which lay toward the coast of Edom, both places being near the land of Uz, where Job resided, who was the reigning prince. Elihu, the Buzite, was the son of Barachel, the Buzite, the son of Nahor, or, as the Chaldee paraphrast reads, "who was of the kindred of Abram." And Eliphaz, the Temanite, was Eliphaz, of the land of Teman, the first-born son of Esau, by his wife Adah.

We also find, in the same chapter, verse 17, that Esau had another son, called Reuel, who had a son called Zerah; and in the 33d verse, it is said; *And Jobab the son of Zerah, of Buzrah, reigned*. Here it is evident that the book of Job refers for time, to the third generation from Esau, which was in the time of Moses. Thus the sacred penman, Moses, who wrote the book of Job, positively declares, that there was an order of heavenly beings prior to the creation of man; and we cannot be mistaken, for he calls them *בני מלכים* *Benei Elokyim*, i.e. *Sons of God*. And though this be not essential, yet it is that kind of proof which no man who reveres the sacred authority of the scripture, will presume to deny. I therefore shall not depart from the plain letter of scripture, which agrees with the most eminent ancient Rabbies on this subject.

The word *נשגב*, *nagnaseh*, is translated, *let us make*; we have seen, that there is no authority for the word *let*; and as to the word *us*, there is no authority whatever, agreeably to the grammar, for such a translation: it cannot be so translated in any part of scripture. The literal translation of this important word is, *WE WILL MAKE*. Here it is to be observed that the declaration is absolute; viz. *we will*; therefore the whole application turns on the manner of the execution of the divine will. Now, if the reader understands the order of the divine procedure in creation and providence, as defined in the Bible, he sees that all things were, and are done in regular order, by means provided to bring about the end designed; the earth brought forth grass—the herb yielding seed—and the fruit-tree yielding fruit. These were not produced in a moment, but in their time, by means, when God had given them the generative principles. Therefore when God said, *we will make man*, by the omnipotent power of the Divine Logos, he manifested his creative energies *by whom also he made the worlds*, Heb. i. 2, and produced the visible creation in that progressive order; agreeably to which he had ordained all things.

In our image, after our likeness. This clause has often been objected to. We have been told that, *an image and a likeness* must necessarily mean the same. Right reason and obvious fact will convince us that this is not so, and that there is a material distinction to be made between them. An *image* of a person may not be a *likeness* of that person; and it is

31 Thus God provided for all that he had made; and behold *it was* very good: so the evening, and the morning, were the sixth day.

NOW the heaven and the earth were finished, with all their host.

2 Thus God finished, before the seventh day;

evident that if a man be wicked, it cannot, with any propriety, be said, he is *like God*, or that he is a *likeness* of God. From which it is as evident, that as the word בְּצַלְמֵנוּ, *betsalmeenou*, is, throughout the scripture, applied to the external form; so the word כִּדְמוּתֵנוּ, *kidmouteenou*, is properly applied to the thoughts and affections. See Numb. xxxiii. 26; Isa. x. 7; Ch. xiv. 24; Jud. xi. 5; Psa. xlviii. 9; Esth. iv. 13. And thus the sacred writer, with the greatest propriety, applied this word to signify the *likeness* of the soul to God, in which *likeness* man was created, and which *likeness* he lost by his disobedience; but he did not lose his image, his external form. Thus he lost his *holy likeness*, his *holy will*, and his *holy affections*.

31. *And the evening and the morning were the sixth day.* The word יוֹם, *yom*, which properly means a *day*, frequently, in scripture, signifies a *state* of things. Isa. xlii. 5: *A day of trouble.* Ch. xix. 16: *In that day shall Egypt be like unto a woman.* Ver. 21: *And the Egyptians shall know the Lord in that day.* Zach. xiv. 9: *In that day shall there be one Lord.* The Persians, who are the descendants of Shem, do not agree with us as to the time which elapsed when God created the world: they are taught to believe, that, instead of six natural days; six seasons, or states, are to be understood.

The first of these states they name מִדְיָוֶרֶם, *mid yusram*, to measure and model to a particular shape; comprehending forty-two revolutions; and in this time, that the heavens were created.

The second, מִדְיָשָׁם, *mid yusham*, to measure entirely the waste, or desolate world, containing sixty-two revolutions; during which state the waters were created.

The third, מִדְיָשָׁחִים, *mid yashchim*, to separate into a semi-pellucid state, to which they allot seventy-five revolutions; in which time the earth was made.

The fourth, מִדְיָסָרַם, *mid ysaram*, to attend, to minister: in this state, to which they assign thirty revolutions, the trees and the grass were brought forth, and thus ministered to the beauty of the creation.

The fifth, מִדְיָרִים, *mid yarim*, to apportion, or set apart that division of the creation, having the power of projecting or darting forth; and in this season, which they say contained eighty revolutions, the living creatures were created.

The sixth season is called מִדְיָפִיטָח, *hames pitah midin*, a draught, or levy of men drawn forth from the similitude; to this they allow seventy-five revolutions; and in this state they say man was created in the similitude of God.

These numbers make 364, which, with the one allotted to the production of the materials before the generative principle was infused, make 365 days, or one year. Thus the Persians believe that the whole creation required a revolution of the four seasons, or one year, to complete the great work.

The doctrine of numbers is also wonderful in scripture, as will be seen. The numbers three and seven were considered by the sacred writers as sacred numbers, or numbers signifying perfection in those things to which they were applied. *He shall purify himself on the third day—Called Samuel the third time—In the third day he will raise us up—The third day I shall be perfected—Do it the third time—Be ready against the third day. Seven days shall thou pre-*

pare—Shall purify seven days—Seven priests shall bear before the ark seven trumpets—Seven bullocks and seven rams—Seven lamps of fire burning before the throne, which are the seven spirits of God—Purify yourselves on the seventh day. And accordingly the Persians say that the third and the seventh days comprehended a state of seventy-five days each, the third having relation to the perfection of all things devoid of vegetative and animal life; and thus the sun, moon, stars, the heaven and the earth, were all completed, ready to influence and bring forth animal and vegetative life; and on the eve of the sixth, or the beginning of the seventh day, God breathed into man, and he became a living soul.

There does not, however, appear to be any authority in scripture for the duration of these states, or seasons; but we know from the sacred pages, that before man was ushered into the world, God prepared a habitation for him; the whole furniture of the heaven and the earth was finished at the conclusion of the fifth day. The sixth day finished with the production of the image and likeness of God himself—even man; and the seventh day was the sabbath, which we are taught by the sacred penmen was typical of the rest that is prepared for the people of God.

NOTES ON CHAP. II.

Verse 2. There are three verbs in this verse, one of which occurs twice, and in every instance improper words have been chosen for them in the common version. The verse begins with וַיְכַל, *vayekal*, and he ended. But if this had been the proper word suitable to the idea of the writer, there had been no necessity for saying, *which he made*; because the passage that precedes, says, *he ended his work*. I have therefore translated the word as the same word is translated in other scriptures.

The verb וַיַּעַשׂ, *gnasah*, which is translated, *he had made*; occurs twice in this verse, and it is so translated in the second place, which occasions a very disagreeable repetition. It is at the end of the first proposition, and at the end of the second. But the translators ought to have known that the verb cannot be repeated on the same subject, unless an additional variation had taken place in the mind of the speaker, or writer. By which I mean something added, to warrant the repetition of the verb, signifying a more perfect state than what is contained in the first instance. But if the word be rendered *made*, in the first clause, it certainly ought not to be so translated in the second proposition. The first refers to the variety of the production which God had appointed or ordained; therefore I have translated it the same as it is in Psalm civ. 19, *HE APPOINTED*. And in the last clause, where the word again occurs, it has relation to the perfect state of the creation, *made*, or *finished*. The word וַיָּשָׁב, *vayishbeth*, is also improperly translated, *and he rested*. Thus objectors say, that the Bible holds forth a God who required rest from his labour in the work of the creation. This form of the verb, wherever it is met with, never signifies *rest*. See Joshua v. 12, and ceased, in the past time, as in the above verse, and is applied to the ceasing of the manna. The same radical form occurs in Prov. xxii. 10, *shall cease*.

his work, which he had appointed: for before the seventh day; he ceased from all his work, which he had made.

3 Therefore God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because, before it, he ceased from all his work; for God created, to generate.

4 ¶ These are the generations of the heaven, and the earth, when he created them: on the day JEHOVAH GOD finished, earth and heaven.

5 Even every plant of the field, before it was in the earth; and every herb of the field, before it grew: for JEHOVAH GOD had not caused rain upon the earth; moreover, nor a man, to till the ground.

6 But a vapour ascended, from the earth, and watered, all the face of the ground.

3. Which God created and made. It is proper here to show the distinction between ברא, *bara*, he created, and לעשות, *lagneasoth*, he made. These words, in the authorised translation, are understood to have the same meaning; but there is no needless repetition in the Hebrew. The word ברא, *bara*, means to *concrete*, to bring forth a *firm substance*, where no solid substance appeared. Psa. lxxiii. 4: *but their strength*, בריא, *baari*, פירם. Gen. xli. 2: *beruth*, and well-favoured, i. e. *firm*. Thus it is applied to the earth. Gen. i. 1: ברא, *bara*, he created, i. e. the solid substance of the earth; he separated, or secreted the solid substance of the earth from the water, and so caused the dry land to appear which was hidden in the water. That is, he had separated the very external without the internal generative principles. It does indeed appear, according to the meaning of the words in the European languages, that to *create* is to *make*; but the word לעשות, *lagneasoth*, comprehends something more than to *make*. It means, after the thing mentioned was created, that it should answer the intention of the Creator, viz. to perform, Esth. v. 8—to bring forth, Isa. v. 2, 4. And as this word is applied to the creation, when all things were in a state of perfect action, and all nature had begun to manifest the principles of generation; it is, with the article prefixed, truly translated, to bring forth, viz. the communication of seminal life after the inert mass was created. See verse 7.

It is proper here to take notice of another repetition in this verse, which is not accounted for in the second proposition, viz. *because that in it he had rested from all his work, which God created and made*. Here is a repetition of the noun God, after the pronoun *he*: the word *he*, of course, refers to God, but the noun God, which succeeds in the same clause, consistently with our idiom, or the idiom of any language, appears to refer to a fourth person, viz. ה' (God) had rested from all his work which God created. But nothing of this nature can be understood in the original. It truly reads, *because before it, he ceased from all his work*; עֲשָׂה בָרָא אֱלֹהִים לַגְּנוֹסוֹת, *esheh bara Elohim lagneasoth*, For God created to generate.

5. Before it was in the earth. This verse refers to that period of the creation mentioned in the first chapter, when God created the plant of the field; and we understand, that this action of the Creator in producing the herbs of the field, took place before they were in the earth. The verb יִחְיֶה, *yihkeh*,

7 Then JEHOVAH GOD formed the man, of dust from the ground; and he breathed into his nostrils, the breath of life: thus man became, a living soul.

8 Moreover JEHOVAH GOD planted a garden in Eden, eastward: and he placed there the man, whom he had formed.

9 For JEHOVAH GOD had brought forth from the ground, every tree pleasant to the sight, and good for food: also the tree of life in the midst of the garden; and the tree of the knowledge, of good and evil.

10 And a river went forth from Eden; to water the garden: which from thence divided; and became, four heads.

11 The name of the one, *Pison*: the same

rendered it was, is the future form of the verb, on which account most writers, and even grammarians, have concluded, that "the preter time of a verb is often expressed by the future;" this is not true. It may be truly rendered in the future time; God created every plant of the field before it should be in the earth; and again in the same verse, *And every herb of the field before it should grow*. It then follows, *Moreover, nor a man to till the ground*; ver. 6, *Until a mist should ascend*. But as nothing is to be gained, I have retained the present translation.

7. The historian is always consistent; the external form is here called Adam, or man, i. e. *ground*; which was formed before God gave him a soul; for it is said, when this spark of the divinity, this divine efflux, was given, the man, i. e. Adam, became a living soul.

We have a striking illustration of the meaning of the sacred writer, in the third verse of this chapter: I have there shown the difference between the verb ברא, *bara*, he created, and לעשות, *lagneasoth*, rendered in the authorised Version, *and made*. And in conformity with the translation I have there given, the sacred writer makes a similar distinction. Here we are told that God formed, or created, man, of the dust of the ground, viz. of אֲדָמָה, the *Adamah*, from which matter his name was called Adam; that when he was thus formed he was only a *dead, inert mass*. It is then said, in addition to this external man, Adam; that God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man (Hebrew, Adam,) became a living soul.

The word אָדָם, *Adam*, in its root, means a matter which is red; hence some have supposed that the first man was created out of a pure red earth. But as we have no authority in the sacred scriptures for a supposition of this kind, those who venture to assert such dogmas, are not aware, I am afraid, that they are attempting to be wiser than the inspired writer. It is enough for us to know that man was created; it would be presumption in finite beings to attempt to scan the works of the Infinite.

9. The sacred historian is particular in keeping up the distinction between these three kinds of trees; viz. the tree of knowledge, and the tree of life, and the trees producing fruit for food; every tree pleasant to the sight, and good for food: and the tree of life in the midst of the garden, also the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.

which encompasseth the whole land of Havilah ; where there is the gold.

12 Now the gold of that land is good : there is the bdellium, and the stone of the onyx.

13 And the name of the second river, Gibon : the same which surroundeth, the whole land of Cush.

14 And the name of the third river, Hidde-

17. *But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.* Many have been the conjectures respecting the fruit of the tree here spoken of ; some have supposed it to have been an apple ; others, with no better proof, a citron ; but the general notion has been, and is to this day, that it was an apple, though no particular class is mentioned to which the word פֶּה, *pheri*, fruit, can be applied. But from the obvious tenor of the passage in the original, there is not any authority for supposing that it was either an apple, or any kind of literal, eatable fruit. It is called, *the tree of the knowledge of good and evil* ; but from what is said, it must be clear to every one, that trees of this description do not grow in an earthy soil. No tree ever produced fruit, the eating of which would give the knowledge of good and evil ; this would be a short and pleasant way of acquiring knowledge ; for man cannot be injured by the knowledge of evil, any more than he can by the knowledge of good. But to suppose, as has been supposed for ages, that by eating an apple, or the fruit of any literal tree, a knowledge of good and evil was communicated to man, is contrary to the narrative, even as it stands in the common translation.

If it were admitted that this tree was a literal tree, producing fruit, another objection arises greater than that of supposing a knowledge of good and evil was to be communicated by eating such fruit. For if the fruit of this tree had communicated the knowledge of good and evil, then it necessarily follows, that Adam knew neither good nor evil before the fall ; but that this knowledge was communicated by virtue of, and as soon as he had eaten, the fruit. Our first parents, however, must certainly have had a perfect knowledge of good and evil before the fall, otherwise good could not have been good to them, nor evil, evil. Every thing of this nature was fully understood by them ; they knew it was a transgression of the divine command, viz. *But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it ; for in the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die.* Now if this passage do not plainly show that Adam was perfectly instructed in the nature of good and evil, then there can be no meaning in words. The truth is, he had the knowledge of evil before the fall ; but the true difference was, as it is at this day, between the knowledge of evil, and the commission of evil.

Again, if we were to suppose that Adam, in his state of perfection, was ignorant concerning the nature of good and evil, or even of evil, as has been said by some commentators ; neither he nor his posterity could possibly have incurred the displeasure of God. Neither could God, consistently with his justice, agreeably to the positive declaration of his word, have given up the whole human race, as involved by the transgression of one man, who was perfectly ignorant concerning the knowledge of good and evil.

Infidels in all ages, since the time of Porphyry and Celsus, in the second century, have brought an objection to this part of the history. They say, "The same person could not write

kel ; the same which floweth, toward the east of Ashur : and the fourth river, is the Euphrates.

15 Then JEHOVAH GOD took, the man : and placed him in the garden of Eden ; to till it, and to keep it.

16 Moreover JEHOVAH GOD had commanded the man, saying : From every tree of the garden, thou shalt continue to eat.

17 But from the tree of the knowledge of

in the first chapter, *Behold I have given you every herb bearing seed, which is on the face of all the earth, and every tree in which is the fruit of a tree bearing seed, to you it shall be for meat* ; and afterward say, in the second chapter, that the Lord God planted a tree in the midst of the garden, and forbade man to eat thereof. The permission in the first chapter, is not consistent with the prohibition in the second ; that they are two different and contradictory accounts of the creation, written by different persons." This has been the language of objectors for ages. There are two kinds of trees mentioned by the sacred writer, viz. a literal tree, or trees, producing fruit, as mentioned in the first chapter, and a symbolical tree, applied to the passions and affections of man, as mentioned in the second chapter. We are told, in the first chapter, that God gave Adam an unlimited privilege to eat of every fruit and herb that was upon the face of all the earth ; for this is evident from the text, *And every tree, in which is the fruit of a tree bearing seed, to you it shall be for meat.* But it must appear, as evident, that the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, mentioned in the second chapter, can have no relation to literal trees bearing fruit and seed, as is said in the first chapter. The inspired writer never meant that the tree of the knowledge of good and evil produced fruit bearing seed, fit for food ; for the words plainly mean, that the tree of knowledge of good and evil, was not a literal tree, with fruit bearing seed ; and the words in the first chapter as plainly signify, that the fruit of the trees that bore seed were literal eatable fruit. It is also said, in the first chapter, that the fruit of all the trees was to be for meat ; but in the second chapter no mention is made of the tree of knowledge bearing fruit for meat. It has also been asserted, that the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, produced fruit literally, because they were commanded not to eat of it. But the word אָכַל, *akal*, eat, when applied to figurative language, as in this case, also becomes figurative ; and as there is no possibility of eating literally the knowledge of good and evil, it means to appropriate that to the life, or to indulge in those sensual desires, which are forbidden in scripture. The same word is used in this sense in the following passages. Psalm lxxxix. 9 : *The zeal of thine house hath eaten me up.* Jer. xv. 16 : *Thy words were found, and I did eat them.* Hos. iv. 8 : *They eat up the sin of my people.* Ch. x. 13 : *Ye have eaten the fruit of lies.* John vi. 51 : *I am the living bread, whoso eateth my flesh.* Cor. x. 13 : *And did eat the same spiritual food.* Thus it is plain that the word eat is always used in a figurative sense, whenever the thing spoken of cannot literally be in the form of natural food. Now, if it be not possible, literally, to eat zeal, words, sin, lies, flesh and blood of Christ, spiritual food ; neither was it possible to eat, literally, the fruit of the knowledge of good and evil.

Again : As eating, when spoken of what cannot be literally eaten, must be taken figuratively, so trees, bearing other than natural fruit, must also be taken figuratively. Persons

good and evil; thou shalt not eat thereof: for on the day thou eatest thereof, dying, thou shalt die.

18 Also JEHOVAH GOD had said; It is not good the man being alone: I will provide for him a help, alike before him.

19 So JEHOVAH GOD formed from the ground, every beast of the field, and every bird of the heaven; which he brought for Adam, to con-

sider what he should call *them*: because whatsoever Adam should call the living creature, was his name.

20 Then the man pronounced the names, for all the cattle, and for the bird of the heaven; also for every wild beast of the field: but concerning Adam, he found not such a help, like himself.

21 Now JEHOVAH GOD caused an inactive state, to fall upon the man and he slept: then

early have its origin from a perversion of the divine command, and as Adam had now fallen into a state, which is declared to be *not good*; it must appear that he had fallen from the purity of that primordial state, in which he was created. Therefore, to produce that good, or to restore Adam to a state similar to that from which he had fallen, God created the woman, and brought her to the man.

And he took one of his ribs. A translation more foreign to the true meaning of the original, could not have been given. In this place only, in all the scripture, is the word *קַרְבֵּי*, *tree-long*, rendered to mean a rib. Now, when any word makes the passage inconsistent with reason, also, when such word, in other parts of scripture, can have no such meaning nor application, we may rest assured that it is improperly translated.

The word *מִטְלֵנֹתָהּ*, *mitsalnotha*, is applied to things of the same kind, order, dimension, or quality. Ezek. xli. 6: One over the other—Hebrew, chamber over chamber. Exod. xxvi. 26, 27: Five for the boards on one side of the tabernacle, and five bars for the boards of the other side of the tabernacle.

וַיִּקַּח, *va yikach*, is rendered, *and he took*; but it requires a word from the same root, more consistent with the obvious and rational meaning of the passage; for this word varies in its application, as words vary in all languages. In 1 Sam. xxv. 35; 2 Kings xix. 14; Isa. xxxvii. 14; it is rendered, *so he received*; Gen. xviii. xxvii. 14; and *fetched*; Num. xiii. 18; and *he brought*. Therefore, this clause will truly read, *Then he brought one to his side*; that is, while Adam was in this solitary state, without a help proper for him, God had created Eve, and he brought her and placed her at his side.

And closed up the flesh, instead thereof. I need not enlarge, on the common version, which says, that while Adam slept, God opened his side, and having taken out one of his ribs, closed up the flesh again. Were this translation, in any degree, conformable to the original, I should have passed it over in respectful silence; but as this is not the case, I feel no hesitation in declaring, that it does not convey the meaning of the sacred writer.

Objectors to this statement say, "admitting it were possible that God had taken out the rib, without any pain to Adam, what do we gain by this, or what virtue could have been given to the simple bone, by being first made a part in the body of the man? or was man made with an extra rib? did not God know that in such case he should have a part of his work to unmake? could not Infinite Wisdom have made the woman of the same materials as he made the man?" These, and many other questions, have been asked by intelligent men, who have a right to look up to those whom they presume, are qualified to satisfy them as to the great work of the creation of man; but have always been told, that "this is one of the deep and hidden operations of God, concerning which we have no right to scrutinize." I shall therefore endeavour to lay before the reader the understanding which the sacred writer had

he brought one to his side; whose flesh he had enclosed in her place.

22 Thus JEHOVAH GOD built the substance of the other, which he took for the man, even a woman: and he brought her, to the man.

23 And the man said; Thus this time, bone

of this first manifestation of the human form, by attending to the plain and rational translation of the original, which I shall confirm by other places of scripture, where the same word must necessarily have the same meaning and application.

The word *וּצְלוֹתָּהּ*, *va yisgor*, is, in the common version, applied to mean the closing up of the flesh of the man after the rib was taken from him; but we shall find that it was applied to the flesh of the woman. Its noun is rendered the *caul*, Hos. xiii. 8: *סֶגוֹר לִבָּא, segor libaam*, the *caul of their heart*, the *pericardium*, the *cover*; that which encloses the heart.

תַּחְתְּנָהּ, *Tachthenah*, is rendered, *instead thereof*; but this word, having a feminine termination, requires to be translated as in Zach. xii. 6, *in her own place*. Thus the passage is applied, by the sacred writer, to mean the interior fort of the woman. That God created woman of the same material from which he created man, and enclosed the uterus, IN HER PLACE. A female corresponding with the form of the man, to increase and multiply, as was ordained in all animal nature, the female for the male.

22. And the rib, which the Lord God had taken from man, made he a woman. The word *וַתֵּלֶקֶת*, *hatseeleng*, is here rendered the *rib*, (as above) instead of the *other*, viz. the *other one*, made like Adam. It is necessary to observe, that the word *וַתֵּלֶקֶת*, *eth*, which comes before *וַתֵּלֶקֶת*, *hatseeleng*, is omitted in the Common Version. *וַתֵּלֶקֶת*, *hatseeleng*, has then, *ha*, to be rendered by the article *the*, viz. the *other*, meaning Eve.

Having also shewn, ch. i. 1. that the word *וַתֵּלֶקֶת*, *eth*, means the substance of the thing spoken of, like the Greek Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end; I have not rejected the word, as it is rejected in the common version, but have rendered the clause verbatim, as it adds both force and beauty, as follows. Thus Jehovah God had built up the substance of the other. That is, in like manner as God had created the body of the man, before he breathed into him the breath of life, verse 7: so, *וַתֵּלֶקֶת*, *va yiben*, he built the body of Eve.

Which the Lord God had taken. *וַתֵּלֶקֶת*, *laakach*, is rendered *had taken*, but the verb is not in the pluperfect tense. Heb. which Jehovah God took. The very same word is also rendered, *he brought*, 1 Chron. xviii. 8. This is the obvious meaning of the word *וַתֵּלֶקֶת*, *laakach*, in Chronicles; for the king, Hadarezer, brought David much brass—by way of tribute. In like manner the same word must be rendered here; God brought the woman to the man.

The word *וַתֵּלֶקֶת*, *min*, which follows the word *וַתֵּלֶקֶת*, *laakach*, has also the meaning given it by the translators, when the idiom of the passages admit such a rendering; but it cannot be so translated here, for the following reason. When it refers to, or is connected with a cause, or reason given in the context, it is rendered by *for*—*BECAUSE OF*. See Zach. viii. 10: *BECAUSE OF THE AFFLICTION*, viz. because before these days, there was no peace: so in Exod. ii. 23, *BY REASON OF THE BONDAGE*, Dan v. 19: *for*—Jer. vii. 7: *even for*.

23. This is now bone of my bone, and flesh of my flesh. In the preceding verses, 19, 20, all the creatures passed before Adam, and at this first time, there was not found one meet or proper to be a companion for him. But when Eve was brought to him, he acknowledged her to be the same as

after my bone; also flesh, after my flesh: for this he will call woman; because she was received by the man.

24 Therefore a man will leave, even his father, and his mother: for he will unite with his wife; and they shall be, for one flesh.

himself. The words *וְעַתָּה הִנֵּה*, *zoth haphagnam*, are translated, *this is now*; *וְעַתָּה*, *haphagnam*, means, literally, *time*, and it refers to this second time, or trial, when Eve passed before him.

And he called her woman. The verb *וַיִּקְרָא*, *yikree*, rendered *he called*, is not *preter*, but the third person singular future in Piel. viz. *he will call*. This refers to God; Heb. And Adam said; for this he will call woman.

Because she was taken out of man. The word *וַתֵּלֶקֶת*, *lukach*, is here rendered, *was taken*; but it has different acceptations according to idiom, as all verbs have, in all languages. It means, *fetch*, *take*, *receive*, *brought*, &c. as above. In the passage we are told, that all the other creatures were rejected, by Adam, when they passed before him; so that instead of Eve being made out of one of the ribs of Adam, as the common version has it, viz. *because she was taken out of man*; when God caused her to come before him, she was received by him, because she was woman, because she was like himself.

24. They shall be one flesh. This is not applied to the man and woman, but to their offspring. Heb. *for one flesh*, that is, for the production of one flesh.

25. The common translation of this verse supposes, that Adam and Eve, as soon as they were created, were left naked in the garden of Eden, and remained in this state until they fell by disobeying the commands of God. But had this been as stated in all the translations, it must appear that they could not have answered the end for which they were put into the garden; viz. *to dress and to keep it*. A variety of insurmountable objections present themselves, and many volumes have been written by learned men, to give this view a plausible colouring: nothing, however, on the ground of reason, in conformity with the original, has been advanced to satisfy intelligent men that this was the case. It is not my design to introduce new theories, or to trouble the reader with suppositions, but to give the literal translation, confirmed by other passages, where the same words can possibly have no other meaning nor application; this must necessarily be admitted as that kind of evidence which cannot be controverted.

The lexicon writers, and, from them, the translators, have placed the word *וְעָרְוָם*, *gnaroumim*, rendered *naked*, under the root *וְעָרָה*, *gnaraah*; but it certainly belongs to the root *וְעָרָה*, *gnarom*, from which come the words *subtil*, *craft*, *guile*; and in a good sense, *wisdom*, *prudence*. See the same word, both letters and vowels, necessarily so translated, Job, v. 12. *He disappointeth the devices*, *וְעָרָה*, *gnaroumim*, *of the crafty*; but if this word in Job were rendered as it is in Genesis, it then would read, *he disappointeth the devices of the naked*. Therefore, it must appear that the self-same word cannot mean both *naked* and *crafty*. Ch. xv. 5. *the tongue of the crafty*. Exod. xxi. 14. *with guile*. Also from the same root, in a good sense. Prov. xv. 5. *וְעָרָה*, *yaguerim*, is *prudent*. Ch. xii. 16. 23. *a prudent man covereth shame*. Ch. viii. 5. *understand*, *וְעָרָה*, *gnarimah*, *wisdom*. ver. 12. And in the next verse, which begins the third chapter, the word *וְעָרָה*, *gnarom*, from the same root, is properly rendered in the Vulgar Version by *subtil*; viz. *Now the serpent was more subtil*

25 Now they were both of them prudent; the man, and his wife: for they had not shamed themselves.

NOW the serpent was subtil, above every beast of the field; which JEHOVAH GOD

Therefore, the true reading of the first proposition will be, *Thus they were both prudent, the man and his wife.*

The second proposition, *וַיִּשְׁבְּשׂוּ, ve lo yishbeshaashou*, is in the common translations rendered, *and were not ashamed.* The translators have supplied the verb *were*, for no such word is in the original, nor is there any necessity for it. The verb *וַיִּשְׁבְּשׂוּ, yishbeshaashou*, which is rendered *ashamed*, in the conjugation Kal, is in the conjugation Hithpael, which means to act upon one's self: the verb is reflexive, the action which a person performs on himself; and as it is connected with the pluperfect tense, it should have been translated thus: *for they had not shamed themselves.* And the whole verse in connection reads truly as in the new translation.

Objectors have frequently said that, "These two chapters, instead of containing, as has been believed, one continued account of the creation, written by Moses, contain two different and contradictory accounts of a creation made by different persons, and written in two different styles of expression. The first beginning at the first verse of the first chapter, and ending at the end of the third verse of the second chapter. The second account beginning at the fourth verse of the second chapter, and ending with that chapter." My business is now to show that the first two chapters of Genesis do not contain two different and contradictory accounts of the creation.

The sacred historian begins the first chapter, by saying, *In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth*; and he proceeds to the end of the chapter, giving a general account of the procedure of the Creator, in the whole of the creation, ending with the sixth day. He then, in the first three verses of the second chapter, proceeds to inform us, that the creation being finished, the seventh day was to be observed as a day of rest. Here these writers make the first story, as they call it, to end, and begin the second at the fourth verse of the next chapter. But I cannot find any such ending as they allude to, for it is one-continued account, or elucidation of the creation. The fourth verse of the second chapter, where they say the second story begins, proves this to a demonstration. *These are the generations of the heavens and the earth, when they were created, in the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens.* It is very clear that the heaven and the earth are not meant as being created in this verse, but the generations, or productions of the heaven and the earth, after they were created. The same expression is used, Gen. vi. 9: *these are the generations of Noah*, viz. these that follow, *Shem, Ham, and Japhet, &c.* But it is evident that, by the *generations of Noah*, we are not to understand that Noah himself was included; why, then, are we to understand, by the very same expression, viz. *these are the generations of the heavens and the earth*, that it means the creation of the heavens and the earth? On the contrary, the historian, in the next verse, begins to inform us what these generations of the heaven and the earth were, namely, *every plant of the field, before it grew*; adding, *there went up a mist from the earth, and watered the whole face of the ground.* In this manner he proceeds through the whole of the second chapter, speaking only of the *generations, or productions by the influence of the heaven and the earth, when the Lord God had made them*; or in the words, as they stand in the fourth verse, *IN THE DAY (or when) THE LORD GOD HAD MADE THE EARTH AND*

THE HEAVENS, they brought forth, by that vital power they had received from God.

These critics, to support their opinion, quote the fifth verse, *and there was not a man to till the ground.* But this proves, as I before observed, that this chapter is only one continued account of the creation, or six days, in the first chapter; for it is clear that Moses, in the fifth and sixth verses, where he mentions the plants and herb of the field, the manner of their growth, and then says, *there was not a man to till the ground*, refers to that period in the first chapter where it is said, in the 11th verse, *Let the earth bring forth grass.* According to the history, at this period, *there was not a man to till the ground*, for the creation of man is not mentioned till the sixth day, recorded in the 27th verse of the first chapter.

Again, another objection has been advanced, in order to prove that "these two chapters were not written by Moses, but by different persons, because the compound word *Lord-God* occurs regularly throughout the second chapter, and the word *God* only in the first. But if objectors had attended to the customs of the idolaters, before and at the time of Moses, they would have seen why this singular distinction was made.

The origin of idolatry, or the departure from the true worship of one God, arose from the manifestation of super-eminent virtues in men; for, as these virtues gave them the highest conceptions of the Supreme Being, they personified them, according to the peculiar application of such men, to the study of nature. Therefore, when the sacred writer particularized those things in the second chapter, which, on the great and general scale of creation, he omitted in the first—had he not been confined to the singular number, when speaking of God—had he not been particular in saying, in the second chapter, that the Creator was *יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים, Jehovah Elohim*, JEHOVAH GOD, in contradistinction to every idol then worshipped, the divine record would not have been sufficiently conclusive against the Polytheism of that day, and of succeeding ages. But so cautiously was he guarded on this most important doctrine, that he declared the efficient and sole cause of all creation to be, *יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים, Jehovah Elohim*, JEHOVAH GOD alone—DEITY MANIFESTED IN INFINITE POWER. From which it appears that objectors have no ground for supposing, by this difference of style, that these two chapters were written by different persons, and that they are different and contradictory accounts of the creation.

And, lastly, infidel writers have said, that, "According to the first chapter, the two sexes were made at the same time; but, according to the second, they were made at different times."

But if the 27th verse of the first chapter be read, it will be evident that man was prior to woman in the historical order of the creation, viz. *So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him.*

Objectors are of opinion, that they "have made no more of the Bible than it makes of itself." But it will appear, from the examples given, that they have made of the Bible what it, to a certainty, does not make of itself; for they have treated those things literally, when the very words inform them that no such things could literally be. It is evident, as observed, that when we are told of *the tree of the knowledge of good and evil*, we are informed, in the same words, that it could not be a literal tree, as no such tree ever did produce such fruit.

had made: for he had said to the woman; But how, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree in the garden?

2 Then the woman said, to the serpent: Some fruit of the tree of the garden, we shall eat;

3 But from the fruit of the tree, which is in the

If we wish to have a rational knowledge of the origin of the universe and man, we must get it from the Bible; for if we were to look to eternity in the "bible of creation," we cannot get any information respecting the beginning of visible things. We may, indeed, be convinced, by looking at the stupendous building of the universe, and by the astonishing order in which the whole is preserved, of the infinite power of that Being, who keeps all things in the order in which they were created. But if the precepts of morality, the rules for reclaiming man from a savage state, to that of a civil being, could be gathered from the *bible of creation*, why have the cannibals of Africa and America remained so long in such ignorance, that they are not yet able to read a single line in the book? It is constantly open before their eyes, yet it has no effect on their minds; they are still in a state, fierce, savage, and barbarous. If we wish to acquaint ourselves with laws, which no nation, however ancient, with all their thousands of volumes, could ever equal, they are no where to be found in such perfection as in the Bible. If we wish to be informed respecting the rise and fall of ancient kingdoms, then we must read the Bible, which reaches beyond the hoary-headed ages of all Grecian, Chaldean, or Egyptian antiquity. If we be desirous of having a history of the most pure morality and true religion, viz. what it is that constitutes the love of God and man, it is only to be found in the Bible; all the knowledge, morality, and religion we possess, are but quotations from this sacred book. Nor is it possible to produce a single precept of morality, but which is contained in, and must of necessity have been copied from, the Bible; for no human wisdom ever could or ever will devise a system of such perfection. And though objectors are endeavouring to introduce the moral precepts of the Pagan Greeks, Confucius, and the sages of India, to bring forward a new system of moral religion, it is demonstrably evident, that all the civilized nations in the world have taken the precepts of morality and good government from the books of Moses and the New Testament. We have the whole sum and substance of all the moral virtues, with what constitutes the life of true religion, in this most ancient of all books, the Bible, and which is finally comprehended in these words, Luke x. 27: *Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbour as thyself.* Where shall we find such a genuine history of true theophilanthropy, or the love of God and man?—not in the writings of Confucius, or the sages of India.

NOTES ON CHAPTER III.

1. *Now the serpent was more subtil.* Some commentators have said, that the serpent is not remarkable for subtilty, more than other animals. But in order to support this expression, in the sacred writings, I will make a few observations on the nature of this animal. Among all the various species of the serpent genus, there appears to be but one which was used in allegorical descriptions by the Prophets, and which was a native of that part of the world where our first parents resided, viz. the leviathan, or crocodile. Buffon says: "He enjoys more absolute rule than either the king of the forest, or the sovereign of the skies, and his dominion is the more durable, as it belongs to both elements;" which is not the case with any

other creature of the serpent race. The prophet Amos refers to this creature, Ch. ix. 3: *And though they be hid from my sight in the bottom of the sea, thence I will command the serpent, and he shall bite them.* The word *uroi*, *nacash*, serpent, means, to eye, to view attentively, with a peculiar quickness. The Greeks derived *δράκων*, a dragon, from *δραω*, to view; and *οφίς*, a serpent, from *οφθαλμος*, to see. Among the eastern nations this word was applied to those who were keen in their transactions, who saw things with quickness; so that the phrase, *a serpent's eye*, became proverbial among them.

Naturalists inform us that this animal supports the dignity of his rule with clemency; his power is not combined with cruelty and rapine, and is only exerted to supply his urgent necessities. When he is pinched by hunger, he covers himself with mud, on the slimy banks of rivers, and, appearing like the large trunk of a tree, remains motionless, watching, with astonishing patience, for an opportunity to seize his prey. His stillness, colour, and form, impose on fishes, sea-fowl, and animals, so that they approach without suspicion. While swimming along great rivers, he seldom raises his head above the water so as to see around, seeking to surprise any of the larger animals that may come close to the shore. When he sees any approach to drink, he dives, and craftily swims under the water till he gets near enough to catch the creature by the legs, then drags it into the water till it is drowned, and devours it at his leisure. Notwithstanding his vast size, frequently thirty feet long, he moves about with great swiftness, often waits attentively at the bottom of a deep river, looking for his prey above, and often attacks boats, using his tail to overturn them. Such is the wonderful sagacity of this animal, which we are at present acquainted with; but had we, in this distant part, so far remote from the native place of this serpent, as complete a knowledge of its natural history, as the people of those countries had at the time when the arts flourished among them, when their naturalists, philosophers, and learned men, well knew, from observation, more particulars concerning the *subtlety* of the serpent, we should, no doubt, have more proof, if more were necessary, to justify the common translation, that the serpent is more subtil, intelligent, and sagacious, than all the beasts of the field.

The literal interpretation of the first chapters of Genesis, has been involved in doubts and difficulties, by most commentators. Celsus, one of the first opposers of the Gospel, treats with levity the history of Adam's formation, and of Eve made from his rib; of the commands that were given them, and of the serpent's cunning, in being able to evade the effect of those commands. Origen, in answer to him, says, that he does not treat the subject with candour, but hides what he ought to have made known, viz. that all this was to be understood in a figurative sense, not giving the reader the words, which would have convinced him that they were spoken allegorically. Cont. Cels. l. iv. p. 189. Origen also replies to Celsus, saying, that "there were far more ridiculous stories among their own writers, both theologians and philosophers, instances of which he gives from Hesiod and Plato, which were all interpreted in a figurative sense by their followers; and concludes by observing, that it is not reasonable to deny to Moses the possession of truth under the veil of allegory, which was then the practice of all the eastern nations."

midst of the garden; God said, Ye shall not eat thereof; ye shall not even touch it: or ye die.

Moses told the Hebrews, that, if they disobeyed the commands of God, the heaven that was over their head should be brass, and the earth that was under them should be iron—a striking figure, signifying to them, that, as iron and brass were the most hard in use, and the most difficult among metals to melt; so, if they should depart from the true worship of God, after having seen such wonderful displays of his goodness, it would be a sure proof that they were the most wicked and rebellious of all nations; which was really the case. The ancient poets have also taken the same liberty of writing in this kind of style. Virgil, in the 6th *Æneid*, says, “an iron voice;” and Hesiod calls the voice of the infernal dog, Cerberus, “a voice of brass;” both alluding to the sounding of these two metals. Also Pindarus, in the 10th of the *Pythians*, calls the heaven by the epithet of “heaven of brass,” because of its firmness and solidity. Euripides and Anaxagoras call the sun “fired iron,” because of the long duration of heat in that metal. From which it will appear, that there is no more impropriety in the story of the serpent, the tree of life, and the tree of knowledge; than there is in the story of an “iron voice,” “a voice of brass,” or “a heaven of brass;” all these things being, literally, impossible. On which account it is evident that the writers never meant they should be understood as such; but agreeably to their original intention, as figures, descriptive of the qualities, passions, and actions, of things, more forcibly represented by them.

Eusebius, *Præp. Evang.* l. viii. says, “That there were two sorts of Jews, the learned, and the unlearned. The learned were confined to the contemplation of a more refined philosophy, and that the interpreters explained to them the figurative sense;” which he confirms by the authority of Aristobolus, and Philo. Also, by the constant practice of that strict sect of the Jews, the Essenes, who always followed this allegorical manner of expounding; which was in the days of Aristobolus, one hundred and fifty years before Christ, called ancient.

Philo, *Vid. Sixt. Senens. Biblioth.* l. v. p. 338, says, “It is a manifest proof of ignorance to suppose that God really was employed six days in the production of things.” And Origen, *Orig. Philocal.* c. i. p. 12, says, “What rational man will believe that God, like a husbandman, planted a garden, and in it a real tree of life, to be tasted? or, that the knowledge of good and evil was to be obtained by eating the fruit of another tree? And as to God’s walking in the garden, and Adam’s bidding himself from him among the trees, no man can doubt but that these things are to be understood figuratively, and not literally, to signify certain mysteries, or recondite senses.” St. Austin, in the preface to his twelve books of the literal interpretation of the first three chapters of Genesis, says, “No Christian will say that they are not to be understood figuratively, when he recollects that the Apostle declares, how all these things happened to them in a figure.” Philo explained all the allegories of the Mosaic law, agreeably to the ancient belief of the Hebrews; and in a treatise on the formation of the world, according to Moses’s account of it, he says: “These are not fabulous tales, such as the poets make use of, but they are figurative descriptions, leading us to allegorical and recondite senses, to which, if any one rationally attends, he will see that the serpent is used for the emblem of sensual pleasure; he carries poison in his tongue—which qualities are truly descriptive of the sensual man.”

The learned Rabbi, Maimonides, says, In *More Novechim*,

4 Then the serpent replied, to the woman: Surely ye shall not die;

ch. xxix. p. 265, 272. “That the serpent has relation to the mind of man; and that in the account that is given of the creation, the ancient Rabbies, from the time of Moses, held that these things, reduced to a historical form in the first chapters of Genesis, were not to be literally understood; but that this was the method by which, in ancient times, they instructed the people.” Clemens Alexandrinus, who lived in the second century, was of the same opinion.

Every clause confirms the settled opinion of the first Christian teachers, that the whole account is allegorical. *It shall bruise thy head.* Thus the promise is, that the seed of the woman shall bruise the head of the serpent; but we read of no natural or living serpent whose head was bruised.

We find that these instructive allegories were applied by the sacred writers, throughout the scripture. When the prophet was asked, *Jer. i. 11. Jeremiah, what seest thou? and I said, I see a rod of an almond tree.* And verse 13th, *What seest thou? and I said, I see a seething pot; and the face thereof is towards the north:* he understood these things as significative of what should speedily take place respecting the nation; because the almond-tree is the first that puts forth buds and blossoms in the land of Canaan.

When he was commanded to take the girdle, which was on his loins, and to hide it, by the river Euphrates, in a hole of the rock, *Ch. xiii. 4*, he understood that, as the girdle had become useless by time and exposure to the air, and thus incapable of the uses to which it had been applied; so it signified to him, that God, who had cleaved to the nation, as a girdle cleaveth to and supporteth the body of a man, would withdraw his support, and leave them to their delusions.

When he was told, *verse 12, Every bottle shall be filled with wine;* when the vessel was marred in the hand of the potter, *ch. xviii. 4*; when he was commanded to break the earthen bottle in the sight of the elders of Israel, *ch. xix. 10*; shown the two baskets of figs, *ch. xxiv. 1*; he understood they were figurative representations.

When Ezekiel saw the cherubim with the face of a man, a lion, an ox, and an eagle, *Ezek. i. 10*; commanded to eat the roll, *ch. iii. 1*; to take a sharp knife, and a barber’s razor; to burn a third part of the hair of his head in the city, and to scatter a third in the wind, *ch. v. 2*; when he saw every form of creeping things, and abominable beasts, even all the idols of the house of Israel, poured away upon the wall round about, *ch. viii. 10*, which were always understood to mean the unclean affections; the two great eagles, and the vine, *ch. xvii. 3, 7*; the boiling pot, *ch. xxiv. 3*; and when Daniel saw the four great beasts, *ch. vii. 3 to 7*; the ram, and the he-goat, *ch. viii. 2, 5*; they understood them, agreeably to the ancient meaning and application of these things, to represent the properties, propensities, and affections, of animal and vegetable nature.

The allegorical meaning of the first chapters of Genesis, is also fully illustrated by St. Paul, *2 Cor. xi. 3: I fear, lest as the serpent beguiled Eve, through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ.* Thus does Paul give the true meaning of the allegory; signifying, in plain language, that the first people were beguiled, or seduced from their native simplicity, not by a beast, called a serpent, but by giving way to their sensual passions. For as this was the case with the Corinthians; the apostle’s comparison would not have been at all applicable, unless he had

5 For God knoweth, that on the day ye eat of the same, then your understandings shall be opened: for ye shall be like God; comprehending good and evil.

6 Now the woman had seen, that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, even a tree to be desired to cause wisdom;

understood the serpent to be the symbol of the sensual principle of man, as the most ancient Jews did before him.

Again we read, Rev. xiii. 11: *And I beheld another beast coming up out of the earth, and he had two horns like a lamb, and he spake as a dragon.* There needs no comment to shew that this is an allegory, like the one under consideration; as there never were dragons, or serpents, that could speak. Also, ch. xii. 2, 3, *A great red dragon, having seven heads and ten horns, and seven crowns upon his heads; and his tail drew the third part of the stars of heaven, and did cast them to the earth.* Ch. xiv. 1: *A lamb stood on the mount Zion.* Ch. xv. 2: *A sea of glass, &c.* Thus does the last, as well as the first, book of the sacred record, contain figurative representations of the passions and affections in man, by the application of the propensities and affections of animals. It is a way of carrying information most powerfully illustrative; and which at the same time shows, that the sacred writers had a profound knowledge of nature.

I shall now proceed to shew, from the common acceptance of the words as they stand in the vulgar version, that they cannot be understood in any other sense; that truth, under the veil of allegory, applicable to the propensities, passions, and actions of men, carries with it a more awful and majestic power to the mind; and that the beauty and sanctity of these first chapters of Genesis, are more forcibly established, than by considering them to contain nothing more than a historical account of a literal creation.

2. The woman answers the serpent, but the answer she gives, informs us that they were to eat of the fruit of the garden, viz. *we may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden*; and, notwithstanding we find a prohibition in the following verse, there was no necessity for this broad permission in the second. The woman introduces the prohibition in this verse; *עץ הדעת, mipri eats, is translated, of the fruit of the trees; but eats, trees, is singular; and עץ, mem, prefixed to עץ, peri, fruit, cannot be rendered by of.* For when there is an exception as to a part of the thing or things mentioned, as in the present case, the *עץ, mem,* is used in that sense, meaning *SOME PART ONLY.* Gen. xxi. 14: *מִדְּוָדָה, midwoudah, some mandrakes.* Eccl. vii. 5: *מִקְנֵי, mikne, some elders.* Lev. v. 9: *מִדָּמָם, midam, some blood.* Psalm cxxxvii. 3: *some song.* Therefore the woman said, *Some fruit of the trees of the garden we shall eat.*

3. There are two negatives in the last proposition, the second is introduced by the *ו, vau*; a word must be chosen which strengthens the prohibition. The translators have rejected the *ו, vau*, by which the clause loses a great part of its force; but when translated, as in other parts of scripture, it shows how strong the injunction was, not even to touch the symbolical fruit. Heb. *Ye shall not even touch it.*

5. *And ye shall be as gods.* The word *Elohyim*, God, occurs twice in this verse; but as it cannot be singular in one place and plural in the other, the reader will see why I have translated the word in the second place, agreeably to its true meaning. Heb. *And ye shall be like God, knowing good*

then she took of the fruit thereof, and she ate: moreover she gave also to her husband, with her, and he ate.

7 Nevertheless the eyes of them both, had been opened; thus they understood; but they were subtil: for they had interwoven the foliage of the fig-tree; and had made for themselves enclosures.

and evil—Heb. *comprehending good and evil.* See also ch. i. 1. where I have shown that *Elohyim* is a noun singular, i.e. God.

6. *And when the woman saw.* Thus it has been supposed that, at this period, Eve was ignorant of the true nature of this fruit; but such a conclusion would contradict the former part of the narrative, where it is said, *but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it.* This error arises from the common translation of the first clause, which supposes that her eyes were not opened to know this until she had eaten the fruit. But the word *וַתֵּרָא, vateere, i.e. and she saw,* is connected with the *pluperfect tense*, and should be translated as it is in 1 Kings x. 4; 2 Chron. xix. 3: *she had seen:* for she certainly had seen that the tree was pleasant to the eyes. From this mistake of the tense, the translators have been obliged to put in two conjunctions, though there is but one in the original.

7. *And the eyes of them both were opened.* The common understanding of this passage is, that when God had created man, he left him in a state of actual nakedness of body, which they knew not till they had eaten the fruit. Many reasonable objections have been made to this statement, by intelligent men, in all ages, sanctioned by the history, which shows that this could not have been the case. It has been asked, "How it was possible for man, in a state of nakedness, to dig the ground, and to dress, and keep the garden in order?" for we see that all animals are prepared with a defence to their feet, suited to their necessities, which man is not; but without which he would have been incapable of doing any thing of the kind. I shall therefore endeavour to give what appears to have been the real state of man at that period, by confining my views to the literal meaning of the Hebrew, confirmed by other passages where the same word can have no other meaning nor application: which is, as observed, allowing the scripture to be its own interpreter. By this conclusive method of reference to scripture for proof, we have done with the opinions of men, and we shall get rid of the mighty mass of error made when the scriptures were translated in the early ages of the Christian church, at which period the sacred language was not understood by Christians, being in the hands of the Jews only, immediately after the dispersion.—Errors too conspicuous for a place in the word of God—objections which have supported the cause of infidelity, the true translation of which passages will show, that the circumstances and things, which were the occasion of the divine displeasure, were not of that trivial nature, but that they were worthy of his interference, and stamp a dignity and a consequence on the sacred record.

Thus it appears, from the common translation, that our first progenitors were not only left in a state of bodily nakedness, but that they were altogether ignorant of the true nature of the divine prohibition; for it is said, as soon as they had eaten of the fruit, that *their eyes were opened, and they saw that they were naked.* It will, however, be seen, by the Hebrew scholar, and the intelligent reader, that their eyes had been

8 Moreover they heard the voice of JEHOVAH God, going forth in the garden, in the spirit that day: when the man covered himself with his wife, from the presence of JEHOVAH God, in the midst of the trees of the garden.

opened before this period. The history itself informs us, that God had given them all the information they required, to distinguish between good and evil, or, in other words, to understand when they transgressed the divine command, and also the consequence of the transgression: *for in the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die.*

In the translation of the first division of the first proposition, the words *וַיִּפְתָּח אֱלֹהִים אֶת עֵינֵיהֶם*, *va tiphthach elohim gnetet she-nehem*, are rendered, *and the eyes of them both were opened.* It is allowed that this clause is applied to the understanding, and not to external vision, which was already opened: see 2 Kings vi. 17; Jer. xxxii. 19; Zach. xii. 4, where the verb to open is applied to the understanding. But this word, which, in this verse, is, in the common version, properly rendered to open, has nevertheless been mistaken in the tense, where it is in the common preter, or past time; whereas it is the pluperfect tense, or the remote preter. Not that their eyes were opened as an effect, in consequence of their eating the forbidden fruit; but as having taken place when God delivered his commands to them. At that period their understandings were opened, and they fully comprehended the nature of good and evil, the true import of the prohibition, *In the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die.* And therefore, instead of its being translated, *and the eyes of them both were opened*, it is, truly—*nevertheless the eyes of them both had been opened*, viz. when God gave the command; for they knew, and perfectly understood the nature of the divine prohibition. So that this word refers to a period prior, far prior to their expulsion from Eden, even as soon as they were created, which makes the whole narrative consistent with itself.

The word *גָּלְעָד*, *galead*, is rendered *naked*. This is the only place, I believe, in the whole scripture, where the translators have given this signification to this form of the word. The primary meaning is, *uncleanness of soul*, what is *shameful or indecent*; this is, no doubt, its primary signification, because external uncleanness pre-supposes the mind or spirit to be unclean. Under the same radix, see Dent. xxxiii. 14: *unclean thing*. Ch. xxiv. 1: *some uncleanness*. Isa. xl. 4: *shame*—it is from *גָּלַעַד*, *galaad*, to be subtil. 1 Sam. xxiii. 22; Psa. lxxxiii. 3; Job v. 12; Ch. i. 4; Exod. xxi. 14; Josh. ix. 4.

We come now to the second proposition, viz. *and they sewed fig-leaves together, and made themselves aprons.* This still supposes them to have been in a state of external nakedness. But at this period we understand that there were no implements to enable them to perform the operation of sewing; and admitting there had been such things as needles, fig-leaves were the same then as now, and we know they are not of a texture capable of holding together by such a process.

וַיִּתְּכֻם, *vayitkhem*, is rendered, *and they sewed.* The leading or primary idea of this word is to join, by interweaving one thing with another; and thus, in a remote sense, it may be applied to sewing. But I find it is the more certain way of coming at truth, to take the primary meaning of the word, when it makes good sense, than to take the remote meaning, when, with such remote meaning, the thing mentioned can neither be accomplished, nor applied, as in the verse before us.

9 Then JEHOVAH God called to the man: and said to him, Where art thou?

10 And he said, I heard thy voice, in the garden: and I feared, because I was imprudent, I therefore retired.

This word is in the *pluperfect tense*, and the first division of this proposition truly reads, *for they had interwoven the foliage of the fig-tree.*

But the great difficulty among translators and commentators has been with the last part of this proposition, which has been rendered, in all the modern translations, *and they made themselves aprons.* In this verse only is the word *מִתְכָּתֵם*, *she-goroth*, rendered, by *aprons*; the only reason to be assigned is, that having conceived literal nakedness to have been intended on the preceding part, they were then led to seek a covering for it.

The true meaning and application of this clause depends on the true meaning and application of *she-goroth*. I have shown, and indeed it is allowed by Hebrew scholars, that Adam was not placed in Eden in a state of bodily nakedness; and therefore that no garment nor clothing was used by the first people for the purpose stated in the translation; they had more dignified views of this subject, views which had relation to the then existing state of the divine government, under the dispensation given for the descendants of the first of men; on which account the scriptures are called sacred. This passage, therefore, having a reference to sacred things, appertaining to the worship of God, the above word, which has in this passage only, been erroneously translated by *aprons*, will, when truly rendered, as it is in every other part of scripture, lead us to a dignified and rational view of this transaction; for nothing inconsistent with right reason could be communicated by the sacred penman; and it will show that it was of such consequence, as imperiously to call for the interference of the divine power.

The above word, which, we have found, is rendered only in this verse by *aprons*, means, as a verb, to *gird, surround, enclose*, in every part of scripture; as a noun, *girders or enclosures*. And also among the Rabbinical writers, who were the best masters of the language, it was understood to mean a *hedge*, or an *enclosure*, &c. See *Eruvin*, fol. xxii. 2: *to arrange*. Jud. xviii. 11, 16, 17: *to restrain, enclose, or confine*. Psa. lxxvi. 10: *to be enclosed*. lxxv. 12: *the little hills rejoice*—Heb. *the hills are enclosed*, viz. the hills where they celebrated divine worship were enclosed with groves of palm-trees. Hence it appears, that they had departed from the true worship of God, as first instituted by him, and had made an enclosure or grove for worship; they concealed themselves among the trees of the garden, in the enclosure or grove. Le Clerc understands "that they made a bower or shelter of the branches of the fig-tree, to hide themselves in their guilty state; for the word we translate *aprons*, signifies huts, or sylvan coverts."

There is an expression, however, which, if it had been attended to, agreeably to its customary application, would have thrown much light on this subject, viz. *וַיִּתְּכֻם*, *mepheh*, *Jeovah*, i. e. *from the presence of Jehovah*. These words were always understood to mean, that place where God deigned to communicate with man. The only difference between the order of the communication before and after the fall, was, that after the fall, no one but the representative priest, could approach the Holy of Holies, which these words, *the presence of*

11 Then he said, Who declared to thee, that thou wast imprudent? because of the tree, of which I commanded thee not to eat of the same, thou hast eaten.

12 And the man said: The woman whom thou deliveredst to me; she gave to me from the tree, and I ate.

13 Moreover JEHOVAH GOD said to the woman, Why hast thou done this? and the woman answered, The serpent incited me, and I ate.

14 Then JEHOVAH GOD declared concerning the serpent, Truly thou hast done this; cursed

art thou above all the cattle; also above every wild beast of the field: upon thy belly shalt thou go; and dust thou shalt eat, all the days of thy life.

15 Moreover I will put, enmity, between thee, and the woman; also between thy posterity, and her posterity: he shall bruise thy head; and thou shalt bruise his heel.

16 To the woman he said, I will exceedingly multiply thy sorrow with thy pregnancy; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children: yet thy desire shall be to thy husband; and he shall rule over thee.

Jehovah, signified; as they were then more immediately in the presence of *Jehovah*. But before the fall, there does not appear to have been any restriction; all had the common right of approaching the sacred dwelling for divine instruction: whether it were Adam or Eve, Cain or Abel, they all drew near to the tree of life; for so far we are informed by scripture. Therefore the clause, *hid themselves from the presence of JEHOVAH GOD amongst the trees of the garden*, have a pointed reference to their departure from the order of worship which God had ordained: Then, in divine mercy, he appointed a medium of communication by the Cherubim and sacrifice, which was to pass through all the representative churches to the time of the MESSIAH; when all representative sacrifices, types, figures, and ceremonies, were to cease for ever, the way was, as at the beginning, to be opened to all, and the divine communication, by the sacred word, was then to be immediate from God.

Thus we learn that the divine visitations to the first of the human race were immediate; that is, God had rendered his glorious appearance as visible as the receptive faculties of finite beings, in this state of perfection, were capable of apprehending him. But that, in process of time, on account of their gradual departure from vital holiness, they rendered themselves unfit to remain in Eden, having substituted their own inventions, instead of the ordinances of God.

8. *The voice of the Lord God walking in the garden.* This clause has often been objected to, and justly; for it is as inconsistent with reason, as the translation is with the original, to say, *a voice walked*; it is the participle active, and reads, *going forth*.

The manner of Adam's receiving the divine manifestation is understood from the following verses: *They heard the voice of the Lord God going forth in the garden; And the Lord God called unto Adam, and said, Adam, where art thou?* which is evident proof, that before this period the divine visitations were immediate; and that at this period it is as evident that he had fallen from his state of reliance on, and faith in, God, because he said, *I heard thy voice in the garden, and was afraid, because I was imprudent*; which must have been brought about by a worship altogether contrary to the commands he had received from God.

We have no authority in scripture for ascertaining how long they continued in this state of declension from the pure worship of God; but that they must have fallen into external without internal worship, appears plain, because the Eden state of things, on his expulsion, no longer remained. A new dispensation, and a new order of worship were given—a Saviour was necessary—a Saviour was graciously promised—sacrifices were

then first instituted as representative of him; and the Cherubim, or representatives of the majesty of heaven; were placed at the east of the garden of Eden, as a medium of communication with God. Thus the intercourse between God and man, which before was immediate, was now mediate by these divine symbols.

Hence we are authorized to conclude, agreeably to the true meaning of the above word, in every other part of scripture where it occurs, that they did not make themselves uprons, but that they made an enclosure or grove for worship; they had, by the subtilty of their inventions, forsaken the pure, simple worship of God—he had prepared an Eden for them, but they must prepare a place for him, by interweaving the foliage or branches of the fig-tree together; and we find that this kind of grove-worship was even continued down to the time of the Israelites. See Exod. ch. iii.

In the cool of the day. For thus the words *רוּחַ הַיּוֹם*, *lerouch hayom*, are translated. But I have before shewn that the word *רוּחַ*, *rouach*, means, literally, the spirit, and as God is a spirit, he must necessarily communicate with finite beings spiritually; to think otherwise, would be to think of God, as of a material corporeal being. Now, as these words can have no reference to the cool of the day, when God is said to walk in the garden, I have translated them as they are literally translated in other parts of scripture. The latter part of the clause, with the *n*, *ha*, emphatic, reads, *in the spirit that day*.

11. *That thou wast naked.* The word *עָרֹם*, *gnerom*, is here translated, *naked*. On the last chapter I have shewn, that this word has various acceptations, according to its form, construction, and orthography, yet all partaking of the meaning of its root, to be subtil, crafty, guileful—in a good sense, wise, prudent; thus, in a perverted sense, subtil, or crafty in wickedness; and thus, imprudent, which is its true meaning in this verse. Heb. *That thou wast imprudent*.

That thou shouldest not eat? Here is no subjunctive mood. Heb. *Not to eat of the same*.

Hast thou eaten? Heb. *Thou hast eaten*. The clause is not interrogatory; it cannot be allowed that God, who knows all things, would ask an unnecessary question. Even Adam was sensible that God knew he had disobeyed the command, or he would not have concealed himself from his presence.

13. *What is this that thou hast done.* The same is observable here as in the 11th verse: All was known to God. Heb. *Why hast thou done this?*

16. *Thy sorrow and thy conception.* Heb. *Thy sorrow, with thy pregnancy*.

17 But to Adam he said, Because thou hast hearkened, to the voice of thy wife; for thou hast eaten from the tree, of which I commanded thee saying; Thou shalt not eat of the same; cursed is the ground, by thy transgression; in

17. *Cursed is the ground for thy sake.* Many writers have attempted to shew, that this passage contains a historical fact, capable of a satisfactory explanation according to the letter. But if the ground were cursed literally, we then are driven to the necessity of concluding, that it was not so fruitful after the curse, as it was when Adam was in Paradise; and so have commentators concluded. It certainly was the business of these writers to have shewn, that the ground was not in the same state of perfection after, as it was before the fall. We find, however, that whether man was in Paradise, or in the open country, it was necessary for him to till the ground, ch. ii. 15, *to dress it, and to keep it*, that it might produce things necessary for his sustenance. These writers have supposed, that the ground spontaneously produced every thing without labour, and that neither thorns nor thistles were produced in the first state of the world. But, in the second chapter it is said, *these are the generations of the heaven and the earth, when they were created.*—*And every plant of the field before it was in the earth, and every herb of the field before it grew.* Now if every plant and herb of the field were formed before they grew, thorns and thistles must necessarily have been formed prior to man. In truth, thorns and thistles are as perfect in their order as any other plant.

We have not any authority from scripture to conclude that the ground is in a worse state now, than when it came from the hand of God; and certainly we have not any reason, from experience, for a supposition of this kind. Infinite Wisdom acts consistently with right reason, and the necessities of his creatures; but there was not any necessity for the earth to be more productive for the support of one man and one woman, than it is now for eight hundred millions. Therefore it is not consistent with reason to suppose that the earth was more fruitful in the first state of things, as such a vast profusion of produce, when there was no necessity, would not have been consistent with infinite wisdom.

Many commentators have given a calculation to shew the productive nature of the thistle, as an evil resulting from man's transgression, in order to prove that the ground was cursed; but the proof rested with them to shew, that thorns and thistles were not brought forth in the first state of things; and that there must have been a second creation for their production, as not any thing could possibly be until it had received its generative power from the Creator. But we have only an account of one creation, and in the order of this creation it is said, that every herb, and every plant of the field, were then created.

The above remarks may serve to shew what a lamentable state modern religion is in. On the same ground we may say, that all pernicious herbs and plants were consequent on man's transgression; henbane and the deadly night-shade, must necessarily, in such case, have had their origin from the same cause as thorns and briars; reptiles and venomous creatures would also have come in for their share of notice, as offsprings in the family of evil: and then we should make the scriptures; what? an assemblage of stories as inconsistent with common sense, as the reveries of the Mahometan imposture.

The translators have rendered the word *בְּעוֹבְרֶיךָ* *bangboureka*, *for thy sake*; but when any thing is done for the sake, or for the good-will we have for another, it is always understood that the

sorrow thou shalt eat of it, all the days of thy life.

18 For thorns and thistles, thou shalt cause to spring forth before thee: yet thou shalt eat the herb of the field.

thing done is good and not evil. This word which in its radix means *to pass over, or forgive sin*, with a variation in its form, means also, *transgression*. Josh. vii. 5, *because he hath transgressed*. 1 Sam. xv. 24, *גִּזְבוֹרְתִּי* *gizbortti*, *I have transgressed*. Prov. viii. 2; Isa. xxiv. 5; Esth. iii. 3. Therefore this word should not have been translated, *for thy sake*, but *FOR THY TRANSGRESSION*. But the ground was not according to the usual acceptation of the term, cursed for his transgression.

The word *אֲדָמָה* *hadamah*, from which comes *אָדָם* *Adam*, i. e. *man*, means *the ground, earth, or dust*. Gen. ii. 9, *And out of אֲדָמָה* *ha Adamah*, *THE GROUND*. So the external body of man is formed of the dust. Verse 7, *Thou shalt eat of it*. The word rendered *eat*, means also, agreeably to idiom and application, *to feed*. See Jerem. xv. 16, *to feed on the word of God*; Ezek. iii. 3; Deut. viii. 3, *and fed ther*; Psa. lxxiii. 16, *he should feed them*. As a noun, *vituals*. The word *of* is supplied. Hence it follows that the organized ground called Adam, was the ground that was cursed, and not the ground which God had blessed with the principles of generation to produce every thing necessary for the use of his creatures.

18. *And thou shalt eat the herb of the field.* In perfect conformity with the above, it will be seen that something more is comprehended in these words, and that the passage has been misunderstood: because it is expressly said, he was to eat the herb of the field, *before the fall*; ch. i. 29, *And God said, Behold I have given you EVERY HERB bearing seed, which is upon the face of all the earth, and EVERY TREE in the which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed: to you it shall be FOR MEAT*. Every herb that was upon the face of all the earth without exception.

It is highly proper to observe here, that a charge has been brought against this part of the sacred history, which is not true; viz. that God cursed Adam. But it is sufficiently evident that no such expression is found even in the common version. The word *אָרַר* *arar*, which means *to curse*, comes from *אֵר* *aur*, the light: this may seem strange. Parkhurst observes, that the light in itself is good to man, but as he transgressed the divine command, this same light operated as a curse to him, as it discovered his nakedness of soul. He was ashamed to see the light, the great type of the heavenly light. This passage conveys this sense, viz. that as Adam by transgression had given birth to passions, contrary to those heavenly affections which had the dominion when he was first created; God informed him that this state, into which he had fallen, necessarily brought with it, all that guilt which was the unavoidable consequence of disobeying the divine command, and which, compared with the innocence he had lost, caused him to stand condemned in his soul, ver. 10, *I heard thy voice in the garden, and I was afraid, because I was unclean*. Adam already felt the curse before he heard the voice of God; but the external man, i. e. *the Adam*, who had hitherto acted in perfect conformity with his internal man, was now in opposition; a war had commenced between them, *lusts that warred in the members*, Jam. iv. 1—*fleshly lusts, which warred against the soul*, 1 Pet. ii. 11.

22. *Behold the man is become as one of us.* There are two things in this clause which require our serious attention; viz. to whom the words, *is become as one of us*, are applied; and the

19 By the sweat of thy face, thou shalt eat bread, till thy returning to the ground; for therefrom thou wast taken: truly dust thou art; and to dust, thou shalt return.

20 Now the man called the name of his wife,

true meaning and application of, *to know good and evil*. This passage is allowed on all hands to be difficult, but the difficulty is greatly increased in all the translations. I have no doubt that the errors which have crept into many churches have arisen from the common understanding of this translation, and from that similar one, Gen. i. 26. It must be admitted that Adam was appointed to know both good and evil, but commentators in general have supposed, that he only knew good. Let the contrary for a moment be supposed, and he would have been incapable of thinking and of acting rationally; if he had not known the distinction, he could not have been an accountable creature; evil to him would have been as good, and good the same as evil: for we can only know what is good, by understanding what is evil. Adam was blessed with all knowledge intuitively; he understood the natures of all creatures, their passions and affections, and gave them names expressive of their qualities: thus he knew both good and evil; but the great difference was, between the knowledge of good and evil, and the rejection of good, by the actual commission of evil.

The verb *nin haaynah*, is translated, *is become*; it is in the preter, or past tense, and not the present tense of the verb; and should be translated literally, *was, or, existed*; without any addition: Job i. 1, *nin was a man*,—and that man *nin was—he was*,—Jud. xiv. 27; Ezek. xvi. 49; 2 Sam. ix. 9. But the translators having rendered the word in the present tense, though no such tense is in the language, have been obliged to put in the third person singular of the verb; to *be*, and the verb active, *become*. When the word *nin haaynah* is translated agreeably to the grammatical construction of the language, the literal sense is; *Behold, the man was*. This view of the subject relieves us from every difficulty; it clears the moral character of God from the imputation of blame, by placing man in a situation so as to be ignorant concerning the nature of good and evil; as we understand by the passage in the received translations; viz. *the man is become as one of us to know good and evil*. For by this version he is made to know neither good nor evil. It silences this old objection, and shows us that Adam in his primary state was not ignorant concerning evil, but that he was innocent as to the commission of it; or as to the transgression of the commands of God.

As one of us. See on chap. i. 26.

Lest he put forth his hand. This translation, in all the versions, has furnished objectors with a most powerful argument in support of the principles of infidelity. On the ground of this translation, they have said, there is not a passage in the books of Moses, that inculcates the belief of a future state. A stronger proof in support of infidelity, such reasoners cannot have, than this translation in the vulgar version.

We have seen the direful effect of this translation, which under the hacknied term *philosophy*, the philosophy of infidelity, has hardened the heart, and banished every principle of morality, from the souls of ambitious, blood-thirsty men. By this translation, such men have been bold enough to encourage a belief, that death is an ETERNAL SLEEP; and thus these sanguine advocates have been led to the commission of crimes, at which humanity shudders. How do the pages of nations cause us to blush, as the historian dips his pen in the blood of myriads;

Eve: for she was the mother of all living.

21 Then JEHOVAH GOD ordained for the man, and for his wife, coats of skin; thus he clothed them.

22 ¶ Moreover, JEHOVAH GOD said, Behold

slain by those who have vainly concluded from this erroneous translation, that they should have no account to give in a future state! We must however make some allowance, not for evil actions, but for error of opinion; I appeal to the learned, and the intelligent, if such are not in some degree justified, according to the common versions; for they expressly say, *Lest he put forth his hand, &c.* By this translation we understand that the man was taken from Paradise, lest he should put forth his hand and take of the tree of life, and eat and live for ever.—Even as he had taken the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, by the eating of which, we understand from the common version, he obtained the knowledge of good and evil. But a little reflection would have convinced translators and commentators, that the great design of the Creator, who created man to live to eternity, and who gave the symbolical serpent its subtlety, was not to be frustrated by its sagacity, or by all the subtlety of the spirit of the infernal pit. God's eternal purpose, the creation of man and his happiness, was to stand, even to people the glorious mansions which he has prepared for all who love and fear him. Therefore this translation in the common version, which cuts man off from eating of the fruit of this symbolical tree, cannot be admitted on the ground of the goodness and the omniscience of God. And we shall find that the new translation, which carries with it a sense consistent with the history, is sanctioned by the grammar of the language.

The first word which calls for our particular attention, in this most important verse, is *in pen*; which the translators have rendered by the word *lest*; viz. *lest he put forth his hand*. I shall therefore refer the reader to unquestionable authorities; first to those masters of the language, Onkelos and Jonathan, who lived before the dispersion of the Jews, who have given us various meanings of this word; and to the scriptures, where such words make this command consistent with the whole tenor of the divine legislation.

The word *in pen*, rendered by, *lest*, is a word of very extensive meaning and application; it is varied according to the nature of the subject, and the series of the discourse. The translators have understood it to be prohibitory in this passage; but as there is not any thing of a prohibitory nature in the whole verse, this cannot be the true translation. I shall therefore point out the obvious meaning. As a verb, its primary signification is to *turn, look, to respect*; all which comprehend a cause prior to such action, which may be thus understood: *for this cause I turn, for this cause I look, for this cause I respect*. Deut. ix. 27, *in va al tepeen, look not*; Numb. xvi. 15, *respect not*; Job xxvii. 21, *regard not*; *in va epen, and I turned*; Deut. ix. 15; Jud. xv. 4; 1 Kings x. 13, *in va tepeen, so she turned*. All which comprehend a cause prior to such action.

In its simple form, this meaning is preserved; as in Gen. xxvi. 9, which in the translation is read *lest I die for her*, but which should have been rendered, *because I shall die for her*: viz. if he had said she was his wife; which was the cause that induced him to say, *she is my sister*. The words *כי אמרת* *ki amarti*, which precede, rendered, *because I said*, are improperly translated with this construction. It was not *because he said*, that he should die for her, as a man may say one thing and think contrary: but *because he thought*, he should die for her. Therefore it should

the man was as one of us, with knowledge of good and evil: therefore now surely he shall put

forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life; yea he shall eat, and live for ever.

have been translated agreeably to this primary meaning of the word *amariti*, I thought; as the same word is necessarily so translated, Numb. xxiv. 11, I thought; Jud. xv. 2; Ruth iv. 4; 2 Kings v. 11.

The same is evident, Exod. xxxiv. 12, where *in pen*, i. e. *lest thou make a covenant*, should be translated, *because*; viz. the cause given in the preceding verse, when the Canaanites were subdued; it follows, *Take heed to thyself, in pen*, BECAUSE thou shalt cut off the sacrifice of the inhabitant of the land. In the translation this clause is rendered, *lest thou make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land*; but *in pen* cannot possibly mean to make; its true meaning is to cut, to cut off; viz. *thou shalt cut off*. See where this word can have no other meaning, Isa. xxxvii. 24, *And I will cut down*; Jud. vi. 30, *And because he hath cut down*; Jer. xxxiv. 18, *The calf which they cut*. Now as *in pen* literally means, *thou shalt cut off*; and never to make; though it is so translated in various parts of scripture; the word *in pen*, therefore cannot be rendered by *lest*, as the above passage in Exodus would read,

COMMON TRANSLATION.

Exod. xiii. . . 17. *Lest peradventure the people repent.*

There is no authority for the word *peradventure*.

Ch. xix. . . 21. *Lest they break through.*

..... 24. *Lest he break.*

..... 19. *Lest we die.*

..... 33. *Lest they make thee sin against me.*

Numb. xvi. 34. *Lest the earth swallow us up also.*

There is no authority for the words, *up also*.

Exod. xxxiv. 12. *Lest thou make.*

..... *Lest it be for a snare.*

Gen. xxxviii. 23. *Lest we be ashamed.*

Deut. iv. . . 16. *Lest ye corrupt yourselves.*

..... 19. *And lest thou lift up thine eyes.*

..... vi. . . 15. *Lest the anger of the Lord thy God be kindled*

against thee.

Ch. viii. . . 12. *Lest when thou hast eaten.*

..... ix. . . 28. *Lest the land, whence thou broughtest us*

out say.

..... xii. . . 9. *Lest the fruit of thy seed which thou hast*

sown, and the fruit of thy vineyard

be defiled.

Also agreeably to the abovementioned authorities, the word *in pen*, has evidently the meaning of the adverb *in an*, viz. or,

also, then, for, truly, indeed, surely, when.

Deut. xii. . . 13. *That thou offer not.*

..... 18. *That thou forsake not.*

..... 30. *That thou be not snared.*

..... iv. . . 23. *Lest ye forget.*

..... vi. . . 12. *Lest thou forget.*

..... vii. . . 22. *Lest the beasts.*

lest thou cut off the covenant; or properly, *the sacrifice of the inhabitant of the land*.

The ancient and most learned Jewish grammarians inform us that *in pen*, comes from the Chaldee *in pen*, which means, then, if, truly, also, indeed: and which answers to the adverbs *in an*, and *in pen*. See Targum of Onkelos on Gen. xxvi. 10, verily; Exod. xvii. 4; truly; Targum of Jonathan, Josh. vii. 7, indeed. And as these two writers are allowed to have been the most eminently learned men among the Jews, and who lived when the Hebrew language was a national language; it is full authority, in conformity also with the obvious meaning of the word, even in the common version, to determine, that the meaning of the word *in pen*, is if, then, also, because, according to idiom, as those learned men have determined.

I shall now select a few passages, where the word *in pen*, is translated *lest*, in order to shew that this word, translated as above, is more applicable; makes a more decided sense; and, therefore, that such must necessarily be its true meaning.

NEW TRANSLATION.

Because the people will repent.

SURELY they will break through.

BECAUSE he will break.

SURELY we shall die.

BECAUSE they will cause thee to sin against me.

SURELY the earth will swallow us.

OR thou wilt cut.

THEN he will be a snare.

BECAUSE we shall be despised.

IF ye will be corrupt.

MOREOVER IF thou wilt lift thine eyes.

SURELY the anger of Jehovah thy God will be kindled against thee.

WHEN thou shalt eat.

SURELY the land, where thou broughtest us from thence will say.

BECAUSE the fruit of thy seed which thou hast sown, even the increase of thy vineyard.

OR thou wilt offer.

OR thou wilt forsake.

OR thou wilt be snared.

OR ye will forget.

OR thou wilt forget.

OR the beasts.

Having therefore shewn how the word *in pen*, should be translated in conformity with the meaning, agreeably to the above named authorities; and the word *surely*, being the most proper word in this passage, according to the positive declaration of God, that man should put forth his hand, and take of the fruit of the tree of life as heretofore; he now being put in a state of trial, or probation, to call into action those powers which God had given him, in order to be restored to that state which he had lost by his disobedience; I have accordingly translated it as I have shewn it ought to be in other parts of scripture, by *surely*.

The following word *nir*, *yishlach*, is translated, *he put forth*. There cannot be a more gross violation of grammar, consequently of the meaning of the sacred writer, than this before us. This verb is translated as the third person singular *preter*, viz. *he put forth*, but it is the third person singular *future*, *he shall put forth*. The translation of this verb in the *preter* to be understood in the *future tense*, I have not found noticed by any translator, or commentator: and yet nothing can be more obvious than that, the words, *he put forth*, constitute the *preter* of the verb. Therefore as this verb in the original is in the *future tense*, viz. *he shall put forth*; the passage cannot possibly be allowed as it is

23 Thus JEHOVAH GOD sent him forth, from the garden of Eden: when he had transgressed

translated in the vulgar versions; it would read inconsistently, thus—*lest he shall put forth.*

Therefore as the sacred writer had before stated, that the first people were not prohibited from eating of any of the fruit of the garden, but of the fruit of the knowledge of good and evil: viz. *Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat—but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, chap. ii. 16.* It must appear plain that the first people had eaten of the fruit of the tree of life, from the day they were created. But the sense given in the vulgar translation of this clause is, that they had not yet eaten of the tree of life; so that the sacred writer could not say, as stated in the common version, *lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life*, but in conformity with the history, and with the grammar of the language, that if he would act in conformity with those powers and privileges which God had given him—if he would put forth his hand and take of the tree of life; then he should eat, and live for ever. The true translation relieves us from all difficulty; the clause literally reads; *Surely he shall put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life; then he shall eat, and live for ever.*

Having therefore these incontrovertible authorities, there can be no doubt concerning the sense in which the sacred writer used this word; as referring to the time in Paradise, during which they had eaten of the tree of life: agreeably to the plain declaration, ch. ii. 16, 17. *Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat, but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil thou shalt not eat.*

The true translation of the word *to put forth*, in this verse, still shows that they had eaten of the tree of life before they were sent from Paradise, consistently with the former part of the narrative. The only exception being concerning the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, ver. 17. *But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it.* As observed.

Thus we see, that by the divine permission, man had eaten of the tree of life, from the time of his being in Paradise; but the prohibition concerning the tree of knowledge, has by the error of the translators, been applied to the tree of life. The reason for this current opinion is, that they have implicitly followed the Vulgate, and the modern Septuagint, without daring to question their authority, or without supposing that the authors of those translations, could be the authors of the inconsistencies and contradictions, which appear in almost every page, of the common version. I have observed, in the introduction, that no translation has been made from the Hebrew only, for near 1700 years; the decrees of councils have sanctioned, the Septuagint, and the Vulgate, with all their errors: these have been the contaminated fountains, from which all knowledge concerning the sacred scriptures, has been drawn. Besides, were the common translation of this part of scripture consistent with the original Hebrew; as the obvious sense is, that man was not to live for ever, viz. *lest he put forth his hand, and take and eat also of the tree of life, and live for ever*; it would be contrary to the whole tenor of scripture, which confirms the great truth of man's eternal life, in almost every page; it would be subversive of the religion of the Bible, the very bond of social order; and if generally believed, it would banish every virtuous principle from the great mass of mankind. The fallacy of such a translation however, is evident, agreeably to the grammar of the language, confirmed by other passages where the same words can have no other meaning.

Hence, notwithstanding many writers have declared, that

on the ground; therefore he was taken therefrom.

there is no passage in the books of Moses which inculcates the belief of a future state; we find, by a true translation of this most important verse, the sacred writer was commanded to record this solemn, and glorious truth—*THAT MAN LIVES FOR EVER.* Agreeably to the words of the apostle, Heb. ix. 27, *It is appointed unto men once to die, and after that the judgement.*

From this passage we draw a most useful and important truth, respecting our present and eternal state. It is plain to every man that he can discriminate between good and evil, that the power in himself by the gift which cometh down from the Father of lights is exercised by his will, agreeably to his inclination. Thus that he was created, and was, or existed with those powers of discrimination, to perceive, know, or feel, that these principles, planted in him, by the Creator, operate, or are manifested in his actions, agreeably to his affection; and thus constitute his eternal state of existence. Therefore the man was (created) as one knowing good and evil: viz. That from the manifestation of the principle of good, agreeably to the commands of God, in following that light which is given to every man that cometh into the world, John i. 9, he knows that he hath passed from death to life, viz. he desires to forsake those things contrary to the divine command, the love and practice of which, constitute a state of death.

The whole of the major proposition therefore, evidently refers to a state prior to the fall, when man was in the love and practice of all that was good; he knew the nature of evil, but had not transgressed the divine command. Whereas now, he had turned himself from God, by suffering his sensual passions to lead him into the commission of those things, which God had forbidden.

23. *To till the ground from whence he was taken.* Here it is understood, according to the common version, that man was turned out of Paradise, to till the ground, from whence he was taken. But this is a thing so unimportant, and unnecessary to have been communicated to posterity, that it is surprising the translators did not see the weakness of it. I have above observed that it was not necessary to inform posterity that man should till the ground, in order to live; for as he was obliged to till the ground in Eden, ch. ii. 15, it must necessarily follow, that he was to till, or dress it, out of Eden.

The word *לעבד* *lagnabor*, is rendered to till; but this word, with this construction, means to transgress. See Deut. xvii. 2, where the same word, both consonants, and vowels, is rendered by the word, *transgressing*. It is participial, with the remote preter, and should be rendered, *If there be found—man or woman that hath wrought wickedness in the sight of the Lord thy God, THAT HATH TRANSGRESSED HIS COVENANT.*

The word *עַל* *eth*, which follows, and is joined with *הַאָדָמָה* *ha Adanah*, refers to the transgression in Eden; and should be rendered by the preposition, *on*, as in Jud. xxxvi. 5, &c. The clause reads; *when he had transgressed on the ground.*

The word *עֵשֶׂר* *esher*, is passed by unnoticed; and the last word *מִשָּׁחָם* *nishaam*, rendered from whence, is transposed to introduce *לְקַחְהוּ* *lakach*, he was taken. But there was no necessity for this, had the word *עֵשֶׂר* *esher* been translated; for the syntax is the same in Hebrew, as it is in English. The sense of this proposition in the common version is, that Adam was sent out of Eden to till the ground FROM WHENCE HE WAS TAKEN; but if *עֵשֶׂר* *esher*, be translated, and translated by a proper conjunction as in Gen. xxx. 26; Lev. iv. 22; Neh. ii. 3; &c. referring to time, as is also signified in this verse; it reads truly thus;

24 So he expelled the man: then he tabernacled at the east of the garden of Eden with the

when he was taken from thence. That is, when he had transgressed, and had rendered himself unfit to remain any longer in that state, he was taken away from thence—Not sent to till the ground from whence he was taken: for we have before been told, that he was created of the dust of the ground: the sacred writings in the original, have no useless repetitions; which always obscure the sense, and frequently subvert the meaning, as in this passage.

24. By the common version we are told, that God after he had expelled man from Eden, placed the Cherubim, and flaming sword, to keep the way of the tree of life. By which it is understood that these symbols were placed there, to prevent the return of man into Paradise.

The first word *וַיִּגְרַשׁ* *va gaaraash* is rendered, so he drove out; but it requires a word that conveys a milder meaning to explain the manner in which Adam was treated after the fall. We naturally conclude from this expression, that he was driven out with violence and in anger. But if we attend to the former part of the narrative, we shall have reason to conclude that there was nothing of this nature manifested, for God in compassion provided the Redeemer. Beside it is not a compound word; I have rendered it agreeably to its true meaning by, he expelled.

The next word which has been altogether misapplied by the translators, is *וַיִּשְׁכֵּן* *vayishkeen*, rendered, and he placed; i. e. the Cherubim; meaning that God placed the Cherubim at the east of the garden of Eden.

The Cherubim were figurative representations, significative of the divine perfections; but of what use could these be, unless God had deigned to communicate his will by them? Solomon says, *O Lord God of Israel who dwelleth between the Cherubims*. The word *וַיִּשְׁכֵּן* *vayishkeen*, with this construction, means to dwell, to rest, to abide, Exod. xxiv. 16, *וַיִּשְׁכֵּן* *vayishkeen*, and abode; Numb. x. 12, and rested; 1 Chron. xiii. 25, and he dwelleth, which will not then read, and he (God) placed, but, and he (God) abode, or, dwelt. Now *וַיִּשְׁכֵּן* *mishkaan*, means a tabernacle, so its corresponding verb here should be rendered, he tabernacled. Therefore as the verb at the beginning of the preceding (23d) verse *וַיִּשְׁלַח* *yeshalchehu*, he sent forth, and *וַיִּגְרַשׁ* *yegaresh*, he expelled, in this 24th verse, refer to Jehovah, in the 22d verse, who sent him forth, and thus expelled him. So in like manner, *וַיִּשְׁכֵּן* *va yashkeen*, i. e. and he tabernacled; refers to, and means the same person *JEHOVAH*; who tabernacled between the Cherubim, and thus communicated mediately with man, by those divine symbols, in the Holy of Holies, immediately after the fall: when the sacrificial worship was, by the divine command instituted, as representative of the Messiah.

I must here take notice of the omission of a word, which is as necessary to a true understanding of the sense of the whole passage, as any other; it is the word *עִם* *eth*, which precedes *חֲרֻבִים* *Cherubim*; and which as well as the *ה* *ha*, emphatic, prefixed to the latter word, is omitted by the translators. But when the *עִם* *eth*, which here means with, and which connects the verb *וַיִּשְׁכֵּן* *va yashkeen*, with the noun *חֲרֻבִים* *Cherubim*, in the same proposition; and the *ה* *ha*, have their connection and true reading; the clause will be consistent with the original.

It then follows *וַיִּהְיֶה לַיהוָה עִם* *va eth lahat hacheret*, which is rendered in the translation, and a flaming sword. That something of a recondite nature was intended to be conveyed by these emblematical representations, must appear evident; hidden indeed to this age, but in those ancient times well understood. It cannot for a moment be supposed that this could be literally

cherubim, and with the burning flame, which turned itself to continue the way of the tree of life.

true, viz. that a flaming sword was placed at the entrance of the Garden of Eden. That there were Cherubim or figures taken from nature to represent the perfections of divine majesty, for such is the meaning of the word *כֶּרֶב* *cherub*, is allowed; because these were handed down to the Israelitish church, and they are also particularly described. But a flaming sword, the interpretation which the translators have given to *לַחַת חֲרֻבִים* *lahat hacheret*, we never hear of before, nor after this time. We find throughout the scripture, that when any thing of a representative nature is intended to be communicated, things bearing some resemblance, or correspondence in outward nature, are always chosen; as a Man, a Lion, an Ox, and an Eagle, for the faces of the Cherubim; but we find no such thing in nature as a flaming sword, which is sufficient to prove that the true translation, agreeably to the intention of the inspired writer, is not given by the translators.

Some learned Hebraists, grammarians and lexicographers, have rightly concluded, that the word *כֶּרֶב* *cherub*, should be rendered in conformity with *לַחַת* *lahat*; but it is surprising that none of them have attempted to rescue this passage from that darkness and error, which the translators have thrown upon it. *לַחַת* *Lahat*, certainly means a flame; Psalm civ. 4, *וַיִּשְׁאֵל* *laheet*, a flaming fire; Joel i. 9, *לִחְתָּהּ* *likhatah*, and the flame hath burnt up all the trees of the field.

This word occurs in Exod. vii. 11. which in the common version is translated *enchantments*; but which were some operations by fire, in the sacrifices, when they used certain drugs for incense, after the manner of the true worshippers. The Septuagint translate the word by *φαρμακείαι*, i. e. *magical drugs*—*pharmaceutick operations*.

כֶּרֶב *Chereb*, rendered a sword, in its root means to exhaust, or dry up, in a primary sense; and in a remote sense, it is applied to mean any weapon that cuts the vein, lets out the blood, and so is the cause of drying it up; as a sword, dagger, knife, pickaxe, mattock, &c. Gen. xxx. 40, *כֶּרֶב* *chereb*, in the day the drought consumed me; Isaiah iv. 6, and there shall be a tabernacle for a shadow in the day-time, *כֶּרֶב* *meechoreb*, from the heat; Jer. l. 38, *כֶּרֶב* *choreb*, a drought is upon her waters; Hagg. ch. i. 11, *כֶּרֶב* *choreb*, and I called for the drought upon the earth. In a primary sense therefore the word *כֶּרֶב* *chereb*; means; as a noun, an instrument, causing heat, drought, or burning.

The above word in Deut. xxviii. 22. ought not to be rendered sword, as in all the translations, but heat, or drought; as is evident from the connection of the whole verse, viz. *The Lord shall smite thee with a consumption, and with a fever, and with an inflammation, and with an extreme burning* [*וּבְכֶרֶב* *va bacheret*], and with drought, and with blasting, and with mildew. And as this word in the above passage in Gen. iii. 24, is written with the same vowels, it ought to have a rendering consistently with the first branch of the root, and in conformity with *לַחַת* *lahat*, viz. flaming. So that *לַחַת* *lahat*, which literally means a flame, in connection with *כֶּרֶב* *ha chereb*; which (as above) means an instrument producing heat, or burning, should be rendered thus, *And with the flaming instrument*; not a flaming sword. So far the verse will read, and he (God) tabernacled at the east of Eden [*עִם* *eth*—*ה* *ha*] with the cherubim, [*וְעֵצָהּ* *veeth*], even before the flaming instrument.

This was the sacred fire with the incense in the censer which was taken by the high-priest within the veil, in the Holy of Holies, before the Cherubim; at which time God communicated

CHAP. IV.

THUS Adam acknowledged Eve his wife : moreover she had conceived, and had born

with his people. See Lev. xvi. 5, 12, 13. *And he shall take a censer full of burning coals of fire from off the altar before the Lord, and his hands full of sweet incense, beaten small, and bring it within the veil. And he shall put the incense upon the fire before the Lord, that the cloud of the incense may cover the mercy-seat, that is upon the testimony—For I will appear in the cloud upon the mercy-seat. And therefore it is said—And he (God) tabernacled at the east of Eden, with the cherubim, even before the flaming instrument.*

These words *וְהָיָה לְפָנָיו* *lahat cherub*, were anciently understood to have a very different meaning and application, of a more interior nature than that of being set up merely to burn in the tabernacle. For at this period and to the end of the Mosaic dispensation, every symbol and rite used in divine worship, was representative of the Messiah. The fire which was ever to be burning on the altar, signified that purifying fire, which should sit as a refining fire upon the heart, to be manifested by the Messiah; and as he was to be the true light to lighten every man, this typical fire, ever-burning, was also to give light; signifying the eternal enlightening power of his word. The simile is maintained throughout the scriptures, after his coming. Luke xii. 35, *Let your loins be girded about, and your lights shining; Matt. vi. 23, Let your lights shine; John v. 25, A burning and a shining light; 1 John ii. 8, the true light now shineth.*

Thus we find that these divine symbols, the Cherubim, were the same as those which were kept in the Holy of Holies in the temple; and the *flaming instrument*, the same as was commanded to be kept burning for the sacrifices before the altar. Now as there were sacrifices in the time of Cain, this important passage informs us concerning the beginning of sacrificial worship, which was immediately after the fall.

The text simply intimates that a place of worship, and consequently all the rites of worship, were then instituted. Agreeably to this divine order in after times, the Cherubim were placed in the Holy of Holies, where God deigned to commune with man. Because God before that period communed without sacrifice, which was not the case after the fall. Nor could any communication be given without a sacrifice, till the establishment of the Melchizedekian priesthood by the Messiah, who was to put an end to all sacrifice.

וְהָיָה לְפָנָיו *Ha mithkapheth* is rendered, *which turned every way*. But this is not the literal translation of the word; there is not any authority for the words, *every way*: it literally means, *a change of state, to turn, or change*. Exod. vii. 15, *was turned*; Jer. xiii. 23, *change his skin*; Jud. vi. 13, *overturned it*; Lev. xiii. 16, *be changed*. Which was applicable to the change that had taken place when the Eden state of things was *overthrown, subverted, changed*; so that man could now only approach the divine, by sacrifice before the *Cherubim*, i. e. the *flaming instrument*, the censer with the fire of the altar, which was taken by the priest when he went into the Holy of Holies; as above. It was descriptive of the mercy of God, *turning himself* to redeem man from the desperate state into which he had plunged himself. Thus the promise of the Messiah, whose coming was typified by these divine symbols, laid the foundation for changing the state of man, by leading him in the way to the tree of life. It is a participle *benoni*, or active in Hithpael.

To keep the way of the tree of life. This clause, in conformity with the 22d verse, as it stands in the common version, has been understood to be prohibitory; whereas the very reverse

Cain; then she said, I have obtained a man before Jehovah.

2 So she continued, and brought forth, his

is obvious. For as by eating of the tree of life, man was to live for ever; if this had been a prohibition, not a soul from the time of Adam to the end of the Mosaic dispensation, could ever have received any benefit from the fruit of this symbolical tree.

וְהָיָה לְפָנָיו *liskmor* means, to keep, to preserve, in the sense of continuing, or in order to continue. Ezek. xlvii. 14, *keeping his covenant*; Deut. xv. 5, *to observe*; ch. xxiv. 8; Josh. i. 7; Prov. viii. 34, *Waiting*. Thus the same word means to continue, not to shut up, the way to the tree of life; pointing out the way to the state which man had lost, by his disobedience, and which he was not then capable of enjoying as he had heretofore. I say symbolically, for these representative figures corresponded to the pure passions and affections, with which he was created. This emblematical representation was well understood by those most ancient people the Antediluvians, who were well versed in the philosophy of nature, as appears from this kind of communication, which remained in all the representative churches. See Jer. i. 11, *The word of the Lord came to me, saying, Jeremiah, what seest thou? and I said, I see a rod of an almond tree; then said the Lord unto me, Thus hast well seen, for I will hasten my word to perform it. And the word of the Lord came unto me the second time, saying, What seest thou? and I said, I see a seething pot, and the face thereof is toward the north. Ezek. viii. 8, 9, 10, Dig now the wall—Go in and behold the wicked abominations—So I went in, and saw, and behold, every form of creeping things, and abominable beasts, and all the idols of the house of Israel, portrayed upon the wall round about.*

The common version has given rise to the opinion, that before the fall there was no communication by the Cherubim, but that God communicated *face to face*, as it is said concerning Moses (of which in its place). But it will appear, agreeably to scripture, that the *INEFFABLE DEITY—the ETERNAL INFINITE SPIRIT*, was not to be seen by finite beings in a state of materiality. God said, when communicating with Moses, *no man can see my face and live*: which is enough to convince us that the words *וְהָיָה לְפָנָיו* *panim of panim*, rendered *face to face*, have not the meaning and application which are given in the common version. Neither is there any authority in the whole narrative for supposing, that during the residence of man in Paradise, God ever conversed with him, as one man converseth visibly with another. It is only said by Adam, *I heard thy voice in the garden; and I was afraid*. But by the new translation, where no word is omitted, as in the common version, and where the *נח* *eth*, prefixed to *וְהָיָה לְפָנָיו* *Cherubim*, has its reading; it will be seen that the Cherubim were not new to Adam; but that God had communicated by them from the beginning; and that after the falling away from the purity of that state in which man was created, having perverted his way, or turned from the simplicity of divine worship; God withdrew the communication by the cherubim only, and suffered no acceptable approach to be made by them to him, without a sacrifice. This view is also confirmed in the 8th verse, by the true and literal translation of the words *וְהָיָה לְפָנָיו* *layom, in the spirit that day*. Viz. *They heard the voice of Jehovah God going forth in the garden in the spirit that day*. So called *גן* *gan*, a garden, because, as a garden is understood to be in better order than the open field, so the divine worship, was in the most perfect order in Paradise. The word *גן* *gan*, means to protect, Jud. v. 8; 2 Sam. i. 21. A cover-

brother, Abel: now Abel was a keeper of sheep; but Cain was a cultivator of land.

3 Moreover, it was at the conclusion of the

ing of the heart, Lam. iii. 63, i. e. hardness of heart. So the LXX. *εσχατισμὸν*; the Vulgate, *Scutum, a defence*; and Montanus *Tegumentum, a covering, or shelter*, which agrees with Isa. xxxi. 3, *יְיָ יִגְדָּל, he will defend*; *גִּבְעֹנֹן, defending*. From which it evidently appears, that the first of the human race were not left exposed in the open field, or to cover themselves during the night among the trees; but that though they might also be in a garden, yet that this *גִּבְעֹנֹן, garden*, was the very place where the *כְּרֻבִים Cherubim*, the symbols of the power, and dominion of the Divine Majesty, were placed; and from whence Adam received the divine communication.

Objectors, according to the common translation, are, no doubt, authorised to say, "that had this been literal, viz. that a flaming sword had been placed at the entrance of the garden of Eden to prevent man from entering again; Adam and his posterity must not only have known the place, but this must have been visible even to the time of Noah; for according to the chronology, Adam must have been living when Lamech the father of Noah was fifty-six years old." But there is no authority for such a notion as this, except the authority of Jerome, in the fourth century, who it evidently appears did not understand the meaning and application of the passage.

We have seen that the above rendering is consistent with the Hebrew scriptures, and it certainly is more consistent with enlightened reason to say, as is said in the original, that God dwelt with, or between the Cherubim, to teach fallen man to observe and keep his commands, and by so doing, to preserve religiously the way of the tree of life—to continue it, not to shut it up; to point man to the Redeemer who was to redeem him from his fallen state; than to suppose, as we are under the necessity of supposing from the vulgar translation, that he prohibited him from being restored again to that state from which he had fallen.

If the consequences of man's disobedience be considered, that he had fallen from a state of finite perfection into corrupt sensuality; that he had adopted a life directly opposite to the divine life in which God had created him; we shall see that there was a necessity for a new dispensation; a medium through which he might ultimately regain what he had lost. And therefore as God, who is too pure to behold iniquity, could not approach man as he had heretofore done without mediation, he, in infinite mercy, condescended to give the first most gracious dispensation.

To sum up all that is necessary to be now said on the Cherubim, it is sufficient to observe, that a reason for the brevity of the description of this divine symbol, in the third chapter of Genesis, may be conceived, by recollecting that the prophet was afterwards to describe the whole more amply when giving directions respecting the furniture of the tabernacle.

Thus the divine proceeding from the mercy seat, between the Cherubim, led man in state of regeneration to put forth his hand, and to take of the true tree of life, to eat by faith in the promised Messiah, and to live for ever.

Thus it appears that the order of the divine communication in all the churches before the establishment of the Christian church, was through the medium of the Cherubim. For it cannot be supposed that so great a familiarity could have existed between the creature and the *ΚΑΙΣΑΡΑΣ*, as commentators have thought. In the definitions which have been given from age to age, God is represented as conversing with man, in like manner as men

age: that Cain brought of the fruit of the ground, a bread-offering, before *JEHOVAH*.

4 But Abel, came even with firstlings of his

converse with each other. The manner of his communication which was established at the fall, has not been kept in view, when we read these words, *and God said*; and this has principally arisen from a misconception, and consequent mistranslation of this part of scripture; where it is said, that God established the Cherubim at the east of the garden of Eden: consequently the dignity of the divine communicator in his intercourse with man, has not been maintained. Thus we find that this sacred order of communication is made known in the scriptures, and that it is consistent with the dignity of the Majesty of heaven, *JEHOVAH OF HOSTS* who dwelleth between the Cherubim.

This view which is made known to us in the divine record, is calculated to impress the mind with the mercy of God, who by this symbol of the divine perfections, condescended to point out the way of restoration to the state from which man had fallen; and it carries with it every mark of awful majesty, consistently with the highest conceptions we can have of the Divine Being.

1. *And Adam knew Eve his wife.* I have before observed, that when man was created, the divine commandment was—*Be fruitful and multiply*. Therefore it is contrary to the express declaration of scripture to suppose that the sexes never answered the end of their creation till they were turned out of Eden. In this clause, the word *יָדָע* *yaadag*, which is rendered *knew*, should have been translated with the same meaning and application, as in Jer. xiv. 20, *acknowledge*. The clause truly reads—*Thus Adam acknowledged Eve his wife*. It refers to the 23d verse of the 2d chapter, when Eve was brought to Adam, viz. *This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh*: for the whole of the third chapter is parenthetical. It then follows in this first verse—*Thus Adam acknowledged Eve his wife*.

And she conceived. It appears here again from the common version, that there had been no intercourse between the sexes in Eden; which cannot be understood in the original, for the reason given, that they were commanded to *be fruitful*, and to *multiply*, and to *fill the earth*, while in Eden. Nor does the Hebrew give us leave to doubt concerning the fulfilment of the divine command, even while in Eden; as above.

But there is another reason to be assigned for concluding that the divine command was obeyed for a very long period before the fall. The word *וָלָדָה* *valadah*, which is translated, *and she conceived*, is the pluperfect, or the remote preter. And to shew that she had conceived, and had borne Cain at a very remote period of the world, even in the first year of their being in Eden; this verb is indefinite as to time; it is written with the first and second Paschta; which is the same as the first and second Aorists in Greek; and indeed from which the Greeks formed their Aorists. I refer the reader to the Introduction, where I have given abundant proof respecting the pluperfect in Hebrew. For though no language can be perfect without such a modification of the tense, because it is in the mind, and therefore must have its mark, or character for intelligent expression; yet Jews as well as Christians, have known nothing of such a modification of the tense in the language, since the dispersion of the Jewish nation. This relieves us from the absurdity of supposing, that God placed Adam and Eve in Paradise to remain there, not more than a few weeks, at the utmost; or as objectors have often said; "Placed there on the sixth, and turned out on the seventh day."

But it is certainly far more consistent with enlightened reason,

sheep, yea of their fattest: so JEHOVAH had respect to Abel, and to his bread-offering.

5 Therefore to Cain, even because of his

as the history shews it is with truth; to conclude that God, as ages and daily experience prove, did not turn man out of the Eden state for *one transgression*; and that transgression erroneously supposed to be only the eating of the perishable fruit of a tree. There is no authority in the original, to countenance an opinion, that God did not continue the Eden state for ages of ages. And to a certainty there is nothing to support the childish opinion, that man was turned out of Eden, comparatively, as soon as he was put in—that the purpose of God was rendered of no effect, by a power, which must in such case have been greater, so as to have subverted the divine command while in Eden; viz. *Be fruitful and multiply*. Therefore, according to the declaration of God, and in conformity with the Hebrew; man must have obeyed the command of God in Eden; he must have multiplied for an indefinite time; and the population on the change of the Eden state of things, must have been exceeding great.

With this view, we are enabled to form proper and dignified conceptions of the Majesty of heaven, Jehovah of hosts; and that his decree, *be fruitful and multiply*, while in Eden, was not to be subverted by a power which had its power from him.

NOTES ON CHAPTER IV.

1. *I have gotten a man from the Lord*. This passage is said by commentators to have been as variously translated as understood. Some say that Eve only acknowledged her gratitude to God that she had received, or was in possession of a man from Jehovah. But the word *na eth*, cannot with any propriety be rendered by *from*, viz. *from Jehovah*; when it is recollected that the person here mentioned is God; for in such case it would mean the very nature and substance of the person mentioned. Neither can it be so rendered agreeably to the application of the word; it has reference to the *future*, and means the coming of that divine person God had promised, a confirmation of his engagement to provide a surety, a Redeemer; and should be translated as with the same construction it is in ch. xlv. 32, *thy servant became surety* *וַיִּנָּחֵם עָלָיו הָאֱלֹהִים* *eth ha nagnar, for the lad*.

This was evidently understood by Eve to refer to the promise made after the fall, which will be seen by turning to the 15th verse of the preceding chapter, where we find that God promised concerning the posterity of the woman, that he should bruise the head of the serpent. *A man for Jehovah*, through whom he was to accomplish his purpose—a man appointed to be born who should himself open the gate to the tree of life, by fighting for man against the sensual appetites, and thus bruising, and conquering the sensual affections, which are likened to the sensuality of the serpent. Therefore she says, *I have gotten a man for Jehovah*, viz. agreeably to his promise, for the redemption of man. That Eve supposed Cain was the person who was to bruise the head of the serpent, appears; because she says, on the birth of Seth, *God hath appointed me another posterity instead of Abel*.

2. *And she again bare Abel his brother*. The translation of this clause cannot be admitted, as the words, *and she again bare Abel his brother*, must strike the reader with a manifest impropriety. Some commentators have supposed that Cain and Abel were twins, and the reason they have given is, “that when the successive births of children of the same parents are noticed in scripture, the acts of conceiving and bringing forth are men-

tioned generally in reference to each child: it is not said she conceived and brought forth Abel.” But the word *uym*, *Paloseph*, though it means to *add*, means also to *conceive*, see ch. xxxviii. 5, where it is used in this sense, in reference to a child born of the same parents.

4. *And Abel he also brought of the firstlings of his flock*. Some writers have said, that Cain brought the firstlings of his flock, and thus that he conformed to the divine command as well as Abel; because it is said in the vulgar version—*And Abel he also brought of the firstlings of his flock*. And therefore their opinion is, “that the word *uym gam*, also, implies, that Cain did the very same thing with Abel.” Such writers will find a positive contradiction to this statement, in the 7th verse, where Cain was directed to bring a *sin-offering*; which evidently shews, that at that period he did not bring the firstlings of his flock as well as Abel. For the *sin-offering* was, a *lamb*, or a *kid of the goats*, Lev. v. 6. But such writers when they meddle with a Hebrew word, should know that words in the sacred language vary their mode of expression, according to orthography and construction. Thus the word *uym gam*, rendered also, as a conjunction, has various acceptations. viz. *thus*, *moreover*, *as*, *yea*, *yet*, *so*, *even*, which are applied according to rule. And in this passage it is exegetical, or explanatory; and should be translated as it is in Gen. xi. v; xlvii. 34; 1 Kings xxi. 19; Prov. xxiii. 15; Ezek. v. 8; *even*, Heb. *But Abel came, even with firstlings of his sheep*.

5. *But unto Cain*. This passage has occasioned much controversy; some have been of opinion that the sin lay at his own door, and others not. I shall therefore endeavour to gain from the original, a knowledge of the cause of the rejection of his offering. The profession of religion made by Cain was in opposition to that of Adam and Abel, and consequently contrary to that which was established by the command of God. For Cain brought his offering, which was not accepted, therefore there must have been some reason why his offering was not accepted. We may, however, collect the necessary information concerning the particulars of this extraordinary departure from the true worship of God by the first-born of men. Cain was told, *if thou dost well, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou dost not well, sin lieth at the door*. From which we are authorised to draw this conclusion, that SIN WAS THE CAUSE, viz. *sin lieth at the door*; and that his order of worship was not consistent with that, which God had commanded to be observed.

The offering in itself was acceptable to God, but it was not a sacrifice; he brought of the fruits of the earth, for an offering unto the Lord. Therefore the acceptance or non-acceptance of it with God depended on the state of his mind and on his obedience to the commands of God: and by attending to the following particulars, we may to a certainty know what was the real cause of the rejection of his offering.

It is clear from the scriptures that the first order of things, as instituted after the fall, continued for a great length of time. In the translation it is said, *and in process of time it came to pass, that Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto the Lord*. *וַיִּבְרָא יָחִי וַיְהִי מִקְצֵי יָמָיו* *va yehi mikets yaanim*, rendered, *And in process of time it came to pass*, do not give the sense of the original, for the words, *in process, came to pass*, are supplied, they have no authority from the Hebrew. *וַיִּבְרָא Yaanim*, *in process of time*, means *age*, Zach. viii. 4; *long life*, Ps. cxi. 16;

6. Now JEHOVAH said to Cain: Why art thou wroth? and why is thy countenance fallen?

7. If thou be good, shalt not thou be accepted? but if thou be not good; lay the sin-offering at

a season, Gen. xl. 4. And *pro mibetis*, properly, the end, or conclusion, Heb. *Moreover it was at the conclusion of the age*. This agrees with the history, for it was at the beginning of the second age, or century, that he is said to have slain Abel.

When man had disobeyed the divine command, and God had graciously promised to send a Redeemer, it became necessary that a medium of representation should be introduced, by which man might look through the type or figure by faith, to the promised Redeemer: and therefore offerings and sacrifices were ordained to be observed, as representative of the Messiah who was to come. Now as sacrifices, as well as offerings, were commanded; and as nothing was acceptable to God without a sacrifice; had Cain obeyed the divine command; had he brought his sacrifice, and had he believed in the promise of God to redeem man by the coming of the Messiah, who was to be the great sacrifice, as all the sacrifices were to terminate in him; his offering would have been accepted.

Thus we find from scripture, that at this early period of the world there were two professions of religion; the religion of Cain, who did not believe the promise of God to redeem man, which profession being founded in the pride of man brought forth the idolatry of the old world, or the worship of departed men; and which descended through five generations to Lamech: and the religion of Abel, who, as above, believed in the fulfilment of the promise, and offered sacrifices as representative of the Messiah, agreeably to the divine command; which descended through nine generations from Seth to Noah.

We may also further remark concerning Cain, that at the beginning, he, for a considerable time, continued to offer sacrifices as well as offerings; because it is said, *and in process of time it came to pass that Cain brought of the fruit of the ground ONLY*, without a sacrifice: for we cannot suppose that during this long interval, signified by the words, *and it came to pass in process of time*, Cain had neither brought offering nor sacrifice. So that Cain in this process of time, despaired of ever seeing the paradisaical state of things restored, which he had supposed would be the case, and therefore presumed to establish the first order of things: while Abel continued in faith to offer sacrifices, believing the promise of God to redeem man by the coming of the Messiah.

One of two things we are under the necessity of admitting; either that Cain for a great length of time after the fall brought neither offering nor sacrifice; or that for a great length of time after the fall, he brought both offering and sacrifice; and then *in process of time it came to pass*, that he omitted, or held sacrifices unnecessary. Thus after the manner of the Eden state, he brought of the fruit of the ground ONLY an offering unto the Lord; he believed not in the promise, which was the reason that the man was rejected as well as the offering.

The scripture fully justifies this view of the subject; otherwise where would have been the consistency of the divine legislation, unless some justifiable reason could be assigned why God rejected his offering? God said, *If thou dost well shalt thou not be accepted?* or, according to the marginal reading which is nearer to the true sense of the original, *If thou dost well shalt thou not have the excellency?* but if thou dost not well, sin lieth at the door. Which evidently refers, agreeably to the order of primogeniture, to him, that he was to have had the excellency,

the gate: then shall his attendance be upon thee; and thou shalt rule over him.

8. Notwithstanding Cain determined, concerning Abel his brother: Now it was, when they

or the priesthood, in which line Messiah was to come, had he done well, by continuing in the belief of the promise, and the continuation of the types and sacrifices, which signified the coming of the Redeemer.

These words, also, evidently mean that Cain had had the excellency, or had been accepted in this sense, by the question, *if thou dost well; shalt thou not be accepted?* that is, thou hast heretofore done well, and hast been accepted, and if thou dost well, thou shalt be accepted again. Otherwise, the question would have been unnecessary, unless it had had reference to his having been once considered the head of the line, in which the Messiah would have made his appearance.

7. *Sin lieth at the door*. This is not consistent with the original; it only says, *sin lieth at the door*; but in the Hebrew it points to the remedy. The word *new sheath*, is rendered, *accepted*; that is, to have the excellency, the priesthood, or dignity as the first-born: viz. *If thou dost good shalt thou not have the excellency?*

רָצוּחַ Lapethach, the door; but this word is used to mean the entrance of the north gate where the sacrifices were slain. See Ezek. xl. 40, 41.

חַטָּאת Chataath, is the word uniformly throughout the scriptures used to mean the sin-offering; which was slain at the entrance of the north gate. Exod. xxix. 14—36; Lev. iv. 24; Num. viii. 7—12; Ezek. xliii. 21—25. Thus the first proposition reads as in the new translation.

The last clause is translated, *unto thee shall be his desire*; but this does not express the sense of the original. *רָצוּחַ Teshachachath* means the work, or attendance of an inferior, one who has the charge for his superior; Gen. xv. 2, which will read, *then he shall attend upon thee, and thou shalt rule over him*.

8. *And Cain talked with Abel*. Concerning the primogeniture, which was Cain's if he had conformed to the law which God had commanded to be observed, and had approached him with a sacrifice. Many commentators have supposed that the passage is incomplete, and have preferred the Septuagint *διελθομεν εις το πεδιον*, let us go out into the field; and that the Syriac, and other versions read so. This may be allowed, because the translators of these translations followed the Septuagint; but there is no necessity for any interpolation. The clause refers to the subject in the preceding verse, viz. concerning the official dignity, right of primogeniture, which Abel was then raised to, in consequence of the defection of Cain; which was to officiate at the altar, and to receive the divine communication from between the Cherubim; to which holy place, no one could draw near without the sacrifice that God had appointed as typical of the great deliverance which was to be wrought by the coming of the promised Messiah. Now as there was no approaching before God without the sacrifice, as no divine communication was given but from between the Cherubim, to the persons appointed agreeably to the order of that dispensation, to which Cain attempted to draw near, but whose offering was rejected; because he came without a sacrifice; no communication could follow this rejection. It must appear that he himself could not at this period, receive any divine communication from God. Notwithstanding he had exercised the right of the primogeniture, as is evident from the words of God delivered to him by Abel, when they were conversing together, *If thou dost*

were in the field; that Cain rose against Abel his brother, and slew him.

9 Then JEHOVAH said to Cain; Where is Abel thy brother? and he answered, I know not; am I the keeper of my brother?

10 Moreover he said, Something thou hast done: the voice of the blood, of thy brother; crieth before me, from the ground.

11 For now, cursed art thou above the earth,

good shalt thou not have the excellency? At which time, the excellency must therefore have been given to Abel, to whose sacrifice God *had respect*, and thus this information must have been communicated to Cain by virtue of the sacrifice offered by Abel, and which accounts for their disagreement as recorded in the narrative. Cain might be present at the sacrificial offering, but it appears from the order of that dispensation, that the divine communication respecting Cain, was given to Abel. So that God did not commune with Cain, at this period, as he rejected the very means which God had appointed, and without which we find he did not commune with man. Had the translators attended to the true application of the word *וַיִּשְׁמַע* *vayomer*, rendered in the common version, *and he talked*; there had been no necessity for preferring the Septuagint, or the Syriac, reading. The proper word according to idiom, is, *determined*; See 2 Chron. ii. 1, *And Solomon determined*. The clause reads, *Notwithstanding, Cain determined: that is, notwithstanding the information he had received concerning the rejection of himself and his offering; he determined, concerning Abel; and thus to cut off the succession of the priesthood in his line, in order to establish the parasitical offerings, of the fruits of the ground only, instead of the firstlings of the flock.*

12. It has from this passage been supposed that the ground itself, though cultivated by Cain, did not yield to him the customary produce, because it is said, *when thou tillest the ground it shall not henceforth yield to thee her strength*. But a supposition so foreign to the obvious truth cannot be admitted; as in such case he could not have procured the necessities of life; so that this passage must have a very different meaning and application. For whether the ground were *tilled* by the wicked or by the good, in Eden, or out of Eden, there was no difference as to the quantity of produce. Therefore we must look for a more rational signification, conformably to the history.

It cannot be allowed that the sacred writer could give it in this form, because it is not true that the earth did not yield her strength to Cain as well as to the other branches of the family of Adam; and therefore some commentators have thought that the error has been committed by the negligence of transcribers. But this could not have been the case, as a whole nation was appointed to be the guardian of the sacred letter.

This error has been made by a misconception of the passage, arising from a total neglect of the obvious application of the sacred writer.

Cain, as before observed, succeeded to the government in the church, agreeably to the established order, as the first-born; from whom to the time of the establishment of the Levitical priesthood, the successors to the office were chosen. We have seen that Cain forfeited his claim to this right, by the adoption of an order of worship, viz. offerings without sacrifice. It appears also from scripture, that the offerings and sacrifices were appropriated to the support of the established order of worship; and therefore Cain as the legal successor, having forfeited his

which hath opened her mouth; to receive the blood of thy brother, at thy hand.

12 Therefore thou shalt serve on the ground; it shall not again give its produce for thee: a wanderer, even a fugitive thou wilt be on the earth.

13 Then Cain said, before JEHOVAH: Great is my iniquity to be forgiven.

14 Behold, thou hast driven me this day from

right to the priesthood, and the productions, or fruits of the ground, of which gifts he and his family partook; the primogeniture passed to the next successor. This being the true meaning of the sacred writer, we shall have a sense in conformity with the narrative, and with the order of that dispensation respecting the priesthood.

The word *וַיִּשְׁמַע* *thagneabod*, rendered, *thou tillest*, is not the preter of the verb to till; but the future of the verb to serve: viz. *thou shalt serve*. It is not applied to till the ground, as in the vulgar version, but to Cain; who, having forfeited his right to the priesthood, was now to serve under Abel, who had succeeded to the priesthood, the excellency. As it was in after-time the same with Esau and Jacob, Reuben and Joseph.

The following word *וְעַתָּה* *eth*, is omitted; which here reads as in other parts of scripture, *and*. Heb. *Therefore thou shalt serve on the ground.*

The next clause reads truly; *It shall not again give her substance for thee*. That is, as Cain had forfeited all claim to the offerings and sacrifices, and having rejected the latter as representative of the Messiah; he was now finally cut off from the succession, and the ground was no more to give her substance for him.

13. *My punishment is greater than I can bear*. This is incorrect language; if a punishment be inflicted, the sufferer of course must bear it. The translators have also erred here by translating the verb *וַיִּשְׁמַע* *minsoa*, with *ו* *mem* prefixed, as the first person of the verb, *than I can bear*; but there is no first person of the verb here. This word with a different construction, certainly means to bear, support, &c.; but the word, *to bear*, comprehends the words, *pardon, forgive*. And when connected with *וַיִּשְׁמַע* *gnoni*, *iniquity*, it always has this signification. See Psa. xxxii. 2, *thou forgiveest iniquity*; lxxxv. 2, *thou hast forgiven the iniquity*; Exod. xxxiv. 7, *forgiving iniquity*; Mich. vii. 8, *that pardoneth iniquity*. The clause then truly reads, *great is mine iniquity to be pardoned*.

But it has been supposed that at this early period the population was not sufficient for the establishment of this order, as it has been thought that there were only Adam, Eve, Cain and Abel. It should be recollected that this state of things continued for one hundred and thirty years, until the time of Seth, ch. v. 3; and if thirty years be added, which was the time of life when those who were designed for the ministry began to officiate, it will make one hundred and sixty years for the increase of population. Now independent of any calculation, let us look for scripture authority; and here we find that 72 persons who went down to Egypt, in 215 years became a powerful people, who had six hundred thousand fighting men; so that it must appear that the population at the time of Seth, who succeeded to the primogeniture, must have been very great indeed; particularly as we read of no deaths at that period.

14. *Thou hast driven, &c.* This mode of expression is not just, for agreeably to the sense, *he was driven from the face of the earth*: consequently, were it literally true, there would have

the face of the ground; even from thy face I shall be hid; then I shall be a wanderer, even a fugitive on the earth; and it will be, whosoever findeth me, will slay me.

been no place for him. The face of the earth, in a literal sense, has respect to the change of state which took place as to Cain, who had rendered himself incapable of filling the office of the priesthood, and so was removed from that part of the establishment, signified by the expression, *the face of the earth*.

But the words, *from thy face I shall be hid*; have too great a latitude, as Cain must have been sensible that he could not be hidden from the presence of God. By the face, or presence of the Lord, as I shall have occasion to observe, is signified throughout the scriptures, the sacred place where God revealed his will from between the Cherubim. Cain it appears had apparently repented, otherwise he would not have lamented at his being removed *from the face of God*, viz. his being obliged to relinquish the office of the priesthood, which was his birthright, his privilege to receive the divine communication from between the Cherubim; significantly called, *the presence of God*. But on account of the divine law, though God had mercy on him, it appears that he was deemed unfit to fill the sacred office of patriarch.

נחמ *Esaatheer*, is translated, *I shall be hid*; but it should have had the same application as in Gen. xxi. 49. *נחמ* *we are absent*. In the authorized version, the translators have made the first proposition to end at *האדמה* *hadamah*, the ground; but it ends at *נחמ* *esaatheer*, *I shall be hid*. This destroys the force of *נחמ* *umiphaneha*, and from thy face; for the *נחמ* prefixed becomes explanatory, and should be translated by *even—even from thy face I shall be absent*. Which shews that Cain in his state of apparent repentance, considered it a punishment to be removed from the presence of God, who had communicated to him from between the Cherubim; as well as to have lost all the privileges of his birthright. But whether this repentance was repentance to a new life, or whether it was on account of his leaving the office, and the privileges consequent thereon; is perhaps not easily determined.

15. In the first proposition Cain is informed that he shall not be slain; the subject is thus introduced. *Therefore, whosoever slayeth Cain, vengeance shall be taken on him seven-fold*. There are two words incorporated with the text in the common translation, for which there is not any authority in the original, viz. *on him*; neither is there any necessity for them. The word *לשבע* *lakeen*, is a compound word, which literally means for this cause, see Numb. xvi. 11, viz. for the crime of murder, signifying that whosoever should kill Cain, though a murderer, should be also punished. Here is the origin of the just law for the punishment of murder, for this law was not given before God pronounced his unalterable anathema against this crime. *Cursed art thou*.

But the latter part of this first proposition, has, from the familiar phrase in Hebrew, (*shall be avenged seven-fold*) not been understood. This word in scripture is not always applied to mean the number seven; for it often means to be fully satisfied; sufficiently, abundantly; to do a thing completely, was to do it *sevenfold*, as if it had been done *seven times*, the word *seven* in Hebrew meaning what is complete, or perfect. 1 Sam. ii. 5, *So that the barren hath born seven*, i. e. as fully satisfied as if she had born seven. Lev. xxvi. 10, then I will punish you *seven times*; similar to the English phrase, "a

15 But JEHOVAH said before him, For this cause, whosoever slayeth Cain; shall be punished abundantly: and JEHOVAH gave before Cain a sign; that not any finding him, should smite him.

thing once well done is twice done," or is done as well as if it were perfectly done by the second attempt.

The word *seven* in Hebrew is a sacred number, it is applied to those things which are the most perfect and holy. Lev. xxiii. 34, *seven days unto the Lord*. Exod. xxix. 35, *seven days thou shalt consecrate them*. Lev. xxv. 8, *seven sabbaths of years unto thee*. So that, to impress on man the heinousness of the crime of murder, Cain was informed, that every one who takes away the life of another, even if a murderer, should also be punished to the utmost extent of such crime, agreeably to the law of retribution. The first proposition will then read so as to be understood; *And Jehovah said unto him, For this cause, whosoever slayeth Cain, shall be punished abundantly*.

But an objection has been made here by some, who have said, "there was no ground for the fear of Cain, that some one might kill him, as there were no inhabitants at that period but Adam and Eve." This objection cannot be supported. Agreeably to the history the birth of Seth was in the 130th year of Adam, and the world had been increasing in population for more than 120 years to the death of Abel. Now according to a fair calculation, in this time the population must have amounted to many millions. See Dodd.

The second proposition in this verse in the common version runs thus, *And the Lord set a mark upon Cain, lest any finding him should kill him*. We have not any authority in the original for this translation. Many have been the conjectures about this mark which is said to have been set upon Cain. Some Rabbies, and from them, some Christian writers, have supposed that a mark was put upon the body of Cain. Rabbi Eliezer, and Iarchi were of opinion that it was one of the letters of the name Jehovah. Rabbi Jose thought it was a horn that grew out of his forehead. But on the other hand, some, as Abenezra, Vatablus, Pleiffer, and others, have concluded more rationally, that Cain was satisfied in some other way, that he should not be killed.

The true sense has been obviously mistaken by them, for either this, or a mark of any kind being set upon him would only have exposed him to the danger of being punished by some of the family of Abel. But laying aside every supposition of the kind, we must be guided by the original Hebrew. The word *נחמ* *noth*, rendered a mark, means the certainty of something taking place in future, which was the subject of the conversation. It is mostly translated, a sign, a token, or evidence. Exod. iii. 12, *And he said, Certainly I will be with thee, and this shall be my token, my evidence that I have sent thee; when thou hast brought forth the people out of Egypt; ye shall serve God on this mountain*. Josh. ii. 12, *give to me now oth, what shall be true*. The verse will then read as above, consistently with reason, and it shews that Cain so far obtained mercy, that he was not permitted to be slain; but his judgment was his being cut off from the civil and ecclesiastical departments, his final rejection as to his birthright privileges, his excommunication, his banishment from the face of God, i. e. the Cherubim; and from the church of God, the great assembly of the people; because he violated the command of God in presuming to bring an offering without a sacrifice.

16. *And Cain went out from the presence of the Lord*. The expression is here very remarkable, it shews us that he went

16 Now Cain went forth from before the presence of JEHOVAH: and he dwelt in the land wandering, eastward of Eden.

17 There Cain acknowledged his wife; moreover she conceived, and bare Enoch: there he was a builder of a city; and he called the name of the city; after the name, of his son Enoch.

18 Likewise to Enoch was born Irad; and Irad begat Mahujael: Now Mahujael begat Mathusael; and Mathusael begat Lamech.

19 Then Lamech took to him, two women: the name of the one Adah; and the name of the other, Zillah.

out from before the Cherubim; where it had been his custom, as the first-born, to receive the divine communication. The word מִלְפָּנֵי *milpane Jehovah*, is truly rendered thus: *From before the presence of Jehovah*. So called because the Cherubim were considered to be more immediately in the presence of God.

And dwell in the land of Nod. The translators have very improperly given the word *Nod*, without translating it. It is the participle active of the verb to wander, to remove, Psa. lvi. 8; *my wanderings*, Prov. xxvi. 2; *by wandering*, Jer. l. 3; *they shall remove*, Jer. iv. 1.

These words, from the presence of the Lord, convey to us this information: that Cain, disapproving of the established order of worship, which God had commanded to be observed, by approaching him who dwelt between the cherubim, went from the presence of the Lord, and dwelt in the land wandering about the east of Eden, or began an order of worship contrary to that, which God had commanded to be observed.

This order of things which Cain wished to establish without sacrifice, was the order observed in the paradisaical state, where no sacrificial worship was necessary. Nothing do we read of there but the fruits of the ground; and this deviation from the command of God: this attempt to assume the state of things as ordained in Paradise, by rejecting sacrificial worship, was the reason why his offering was rejected, as above.

23, 24. And Lamech said, &c. This statement concerning Lamech, as having killed a man to his wounding, and a young man to his hurt, has employed the pens of translators and commentators in all ages since the dispersion of the Jews. Many ingenious theories have been framed, among Christians, and the pages of the Rabbies have contributed not a little, to swell the volumes of unfounded suppositions, and uncertain conclusions. I will therefore draw what information we can depend on, from the original Hebrew respecting these abstruse passages.

Dr. Shockford and others have supposed that the family of Lamech were afraid that some of the family of Abel, would revenge his death. But this is only supposition; every thing of this nature must have been forgotten, as far as it related to retribution; for Lamech, who was the seventh from Adam by Cain, must have been living, according to the history, at the time of Enoch, who was the seventh from Adam in the line of Seth. So that a period of 600 years had elapsed from the time of Cain, when the population must have been very great: therefore a supposition of this nature, is out of the question.

Hear my voice. *שמע קולי* *שמע קולי*, is properly rendered *hear*; but as Lamech once called on his people to hear him, it is not

20 Now Adah bare Jabal: he was, the father, of dwellers in tents, for cattle.

21 And the name of his brother, was Jubal: he was, the father, of all who handle the harp, and organ.

22 Likewise Zillah, she also bare Tubal-cain; an instructor of every worker of brass, and iron: and the sister of Tubal-cain, was Naamah.

23 Moreover Lamech said to his wives, Adah and Zillah hear my voice; wives of Lamech; regard my declaration: if I had slain a man for injuring me; even a child of my progenitor;

24 If Cain shall be punished seven-fold: truly Lamech seventy and seven-fold.

likely that he should call on them again to hearken to him, in the following clause. *שמע קולי* *Hazecnah*, does not here mean to hearken only with the ear, but it has also a reference to the mind, to consider, to be advised, to regard.

שמע קולי *Imraathi*, rendered *my speech*, is more properly rendered *my declaration*: and by this rendering, we have a far better sense.

I have slain a man, &c. This is not the true reading: for if Lamech had slain a man, the word *כי* *ki*, which is rendered by *for*, viz. *for I have slain a man*, would have been unnecessary. The sentence is put by way of supposition, as the sense of the narrative, and the accents prove; to show his people, that if he had slain a man, in like manner as Cain had done, with a design to subvert the sacrificial worship, which God had commanded to be observed; the same law would have operated on his successor, from Adah, or Zillah: for this word is not rendered by *young man*, in any part of scripture. I have therefore translated *כי* *ki*, as with the same construction it is so translated in other passages, by *if*.

Lamech therefore having seen, that the transgression of Cain, was not only the murder of his brother, but that it was an attempt to destroy the faith of the church, respecting the coming of Messiah, by abolishing sacrificial worship, to establish the Eden state of things: viz. offerings, without sacrifice; acknowledges the justice of the divine decree, which in the 15th verse is said to be a punishment sevenfold, and which was to be executed on him who should slay Cain; or in other words, on any one who committed murder. He therefore, to shew the justice of this law for the security of individuals, says, *אִם אֶשׁ חָרַגְתִּי* *ki aish haargati*; *if I had slain a man*; *לְחַבְרַתִּי* *haargati*, i. e. *I had slain*, is the pluperfect tense, and ought to be translated, as with this construction verbs are necessarily so translated in other parts of scripture.

And a young man to my hurt. This is not intelligible; *man*, and *young man*—wounding and hurt; are repetitions which we do not find in the original. By this translation we are led to conclude, that Lamech slew two, as he is made in the common version to say—*I have slain a man to my wounding, and a young man to my hurt*. But it appears from the Hebrew that he did not slay any one. The word *לְחַבְרַתִּי* *lechaburathi*, rendered, *my hurt*; means to be united, Chron. xx. 37; to be allied, Dan. v. 6. It was applied by Lamech, to his progenitor, by comparison with Cain, who had slain the *יָלֵד* *yeled*, a child of his progenitor. Therefore he said, *if I had slain a man for injuring me, even a child of my progenitor*. From which we learn that the life of man was held sacred; that revenge, against a person even been injured, was prohibited by the divine law,

25 Now Adam henceforth had respect to Eve his wife, who bare a son; and she called his name Seth: saying, For God hath appointed to

among the first descendants of Adam: as in after-time when the law was given on Sinai. This also shews that the divine law was always the same, in the three churches, under Adam, Noah, and Moses, and thus it remains in its fulness under the Christian dispensation.

25. If Cain shall be avenged sevenfold. This was in the seventh descent from Cain, and it does not appear that Cain was alive, at this remote period from the death of Abel; for he then was one hundred and thirty years old. Indeed it is singular, that not any of the ages of the descendants of Cain, were directed to be recorded. Some commentators have thought, that the sacred writer omitted their ages, because of the transgression of their progenitor in slaying Abel. This however cannot be allowed, because it is not consistent with the original, and the same reasoning would apply to the descendants of Adam by Seth, on account of his transgression. But if we attend to the Hebrew, the reason will appear plain.

We have seen that the first people had forsaken the primæval worship; they retired from the presence of God, into the enclosures, or groves, they had made for their own worship. We have also seen that Cain began to establish the worship of God without sacrifice, after the manner of the fallen state in Eden, which finally caused them to be banished from it. And in the 3d verse of this chapter, we learn that he totally rejected the then established worship of God by sacrifice, and confirmed it in the 16th verse; for it is there said, *he went forth, מִן־פְּנֵי יְהוָה miḥphace Jehovah, i. e. from before the presence of Jehovah.* That was from before the Cherubim, when he was in the exercise of the priesthood, called more immediately, the presence of Jehovah; because from thence, he communicated with man. And this appears to have been near a hundred years after he had entered on the ministry; for the time of their admission to the office was at thirty years of their age; see on the 11th chapter. And it is said concerning Cain; *In process of time it came to pass, that Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto the Lord.* That is after a long time, during which he must have brought the firstlings of his flock; he then rejected the sacrificial worship, and brought only the fruit of the ground, as was the custom in Paradise.

It should always be remembered, that from the beginning, God communicated his will from between the Cherubim, concerning the fate of Cain's posterity; who, as we shall find, had forsaken the worship of God. From the whole tenor of the passage we also see that the family of Lamech had entered into controversy about the fulfilment of God's decree on the posterity of Cain; when Lamech, who appears to have been sensible of the justice of the divine decree, called them together, and we have his speech in the 24th verses.

But these two verses are altogether unintelligible as they stand in the translation; they have no relation to any preceding subject, nor do they refer to any thing future, so as to enable us to apply them. All the information we can gather from the common translation is, that Lamech calls his people together, to inform them that he had slain a man to his wounding, and a young man to his hurt. The language is also improper, for wounding and hurt are the same; as well as man and young man, as observed.

Hence if Cain was punished by being cut off from the exercise of the primogeniture during one seven-fold, or one complete term, i. e. seven generations, as the word שֶׁבַע shetgathim

me another successor; instead of Abel; because Cain slew him.

26 Moreover to Seth also was born a Son;

signifies; so this curse, or cutting off, was to continue to the time of Lamech, who was the seventh from Adam in the line of Cain; and Cain in himself and his posterity, was punished sevenfold. At which period the true worship of God which had been lost in the line of Cain, was established by Enoch, who was the seventh from Adam in the line of Seth. Thus it shows the accomplishment of the curse or separation, which God pronounced in the 15th verse, when Cain, agreeably to the divine law, having forfeited the right of Messiah's coming from him; the patriarchal and regal authority passed over to the line of Seth; and Enoch became, as the word signifies, the representative of the true Messiah.

We may also gather this information from this passage, viz. that as in after time, for certain crimes, offenders were cut off from the privileges which were enjoyed by the congregation to the third, fourth, and tenth generation: so it appears that the sentence of the law for the punishment of such crimes as Cain was guilty of, was to banish him, and to exclude his posterity from exercising the privileges of his birth-right to the seventh generation. What, if no legal descendant had appeared, and his posterity having returned to the true worship of God; they would have been accepted as the rightful heirs, and would again have assumed the rights and privileges of the primogeniture.

Thus we see that this part of the narrative refers to the succession in the priestly office; for Lamech is the last on record in the line of Cain, who being cut off from the priesthood, the next verse informs us, that the succession to the sacred office was to be in the line of Seth. It is there said, *for God hath appointed me another seed instead of Abel:* had this not been the case, Enoch the son of Cain would have succeeded to the office. Thus it appears that the penalty imposed by the divine law at this period for crimes which Cain was guilty of, was excommunication from the church and from society, a total exclusion from the privileges of the primogeniture, for seven generations. This is confirmed in the following part of scripture when God renewed the dispensation to Noah, for the earth was filled with violence, ch. vi. 10: a new law was given, to check the corruption and violence of that age: ch. ix. 6, *Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed.*

25. And Adam knew Eve his wife again. The word יָדָע yadag, rendered knew, requires to be translated as the same word is Exod. ii. 25, had respect.

וָאָמְרָא Vathikra, is rendered, and she called; but by thus rendering the word, the translators were under the necessity of putting in the words, *said she*, for which there is not any authority in the original. According to the idiom of the verb; it means to declare, to shew, to manifest, to make known; and will be truly rendered as the verb is in Job xvii. 14, and she said. וָאָמְרָא is rendered, seed, but improperly; for Seth was at this time born; I have therefore translated the word according to its obvious sense, by successor.

26. Then began men to call upon the name of the Lord. This clause in the authorised version does not give the sense of the original; for it appears by this reading, that men began to call on the name of the Lord agreeably to the order he had established, but this was not the case. The word בְּרִיחַ hauchal, which has been translated by the word began; means to prophane, to pollute: Lev. x. 10; ch. xxi. 9 14; Ezek. xxii. 26; and the word קָרָא likra, which is rendered to call, has the

and he called his name Enos; who began to prophane, in the name of JEHOVAH.

CHAP. V.

THIS is the book, of the generation of Adam: In the day God created Adam; in the likeness of God he made him;

same application as it has in Nch. vi. 7, to preach; Isa. lxi. 1, to preach. With regard to the nature of this prophane preaching or calling on the name of the Lord, we have sufficient reason for concluding that they pretended to call on him through the idols they worshipped, as we find this idolatrous, prophane preaching, or calling on the name of the Lord, was handed down to the nations by these original idolaters, even to the time when the Hebrews came out of Egypt. For they had been accustomed to observe the idolatry of the Egyptians, and they set up the golden calf. Now it is certain that they at this period also, pretended to worship God through these idols, as they called on the name of the Lord by this idolatrous worship, Exod. xxxii. 5, And when Aaron saw it, he built an altar before it, and Aaron made proclamation and said, to morrow is a feast of the Lord: which is sufficient evidence to convince us, that they pretended to worship God through images, after the manner of the prophane worship of the Egyptians, and of the Antediluvians.

This was the opinion of the most eminent Jewish Doctors. Maimonides says, "In the time of Enos, the children of Adam began to sin greatly. They said, As God hath created the stars to govern the world, and hath given them honour by setting them on high, and as they are ministers that minister before him, it is right that men should glorify and give honour to them. Then they began to build temples, to make images as representative of the heavenly bodies, and worshipped them." Main. in Mishn. This was handed down to the ancient Canaanites, who were worshippers of the host of heaven. See on ver. 1, of the next chapter.

The second order of the Patriarchs begins with Noah. The word Noah, means rest, or to lead with gentleness and peace. This name was given to the first patriarch, because it was foretold that through him, the church, which had departed from its original purity, was again to be established. Gen. v. 29, And he called his name Noah, saying, This same shall comfort us concerning our work and toil of our hands, because of the ground which the Lord hath cursed. From this passage we learn, that the divine communication from between the Cherubim, was continued to the second order of patriarchs, notwithstanding the first church had come to its consummation in the time of Lamech. He was instructed to communicate this information, which was given him according to the appointed order of that dispensation.

We find that God gave a new dispensation to Noah, comprehending seven commandments.

- 1st. That they should not commit adultery.
- 2nd. That they were not to blaspheme.
- 3rd. That they should appoint just judges.
- 4th. That they were not to commit incest.
- 5th. That they were not to commit murder, or injure any one.
- 6th. That they were not to steal, rob, or plunder.
- 7th. That they were not to eat flesh with the blood thereof.

These were the seven precepts given to Noah when God renewed the promise of the coming of the Messiah to him; a strict observance of which, was to ensure rest or peace to the church. From which we may to a certainty conclude that all

2 Male, and female, he created them: moreover he blessed them, and he called their name Adam, in the day when he created them.

3 And Adam lived an hundred and thirty years; now there was born a son in his likeness, after his image: and he called his name, Seth.

4 Moreover the days of Adam after the birth

things prohibited in this dispensation, constituted the crimes of the Antediluvians.

Shem succeeded Noah in the supreme government of church and state, which appears to have received the form and order of the first patriarchal institution. He was a zealous promoter of the worship of the true God, and believed that the ancient promise of a Redeemer would, in the fulness of time, be accomplished; on which account the HOLY ONE was to come in his line.

Shem, means primarily, to put in order, to place, to apply, to put in array, and in a secondary sense, a name, as having been put in order to be distinguished. Thus we meet with שֵׁם ה' the name of the Lord; and from this word also the word heaven is derived, because every thing there is placed in the most perfect order.

The name Shem was given to this son of Noah, because he was to place and keep in order all things respecting the worship of the true God, in opposition to that of the worship of idols; which was established in the line of Ham. On this account it was that the venerable patriarch, in the spirit of prophecy, was instructed to say what should take place among the descendants of Shem and Ham, 1500 years before it was accomplished; Gen. ix. ver. 25, 26, Blessed be the Lord God of Shem, and Canaan shall be his servant. Cursed be Canaan, a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren. The literal meaning of which in the original Hebrew is, that Shem and his posterity will worship the Lord God of Heaven, and the Canaanites the descendants of Ham shall be his servants. Which was literally accomplished at the time when the Israelites came out of Egypt, for the Canaanites were conquered by the Hebrews, and thus became their servants, who were servants to the Egyptians.

Arphaxad succeeded Shem in the government of the church and state; he was the third son of Shem, and was according to that ancient constitution a priest as well as a temporal patriarchal king. The word Arphaxad, is a compound word, and means, to pour forth, and spread abroad the light. He appears to have been so named, because at this period he and the church spread abroad the divine light concerning the coming of the Redeemer, which light, as well as the belief in him, was to lighten every man that cometh into the world. Among all the sons of righteous Shem, Arphaxad was chosen to be the visible head of the true church of God, in whose line the Shiloh, the deliverer, and the light of the world came, and he was therefore properly called Arphaxad, or the spreader abroad of the divine light.

Salah succeeded Arphaxad. The name Salah, which means, to put or send forth, as a tree its branches, was given to him by his father Arphaxad, because in his time the church, over which he was to preside, began to increase and spread forth its doctrines, in opposition to the idolatrous notions of that day.

Eber the son of Salah succeeded to the government of the church. Eber is a word which relates to the covenant of God with man, viz. to redeem him from the calamities of the fall by the coming of the Messiah. It means, to pass over, and is used in this sense in scripture, alluding to the patriarchal custom of passing between the parts of a divided sacrifice, Gen. xv. 10, Jer. xxxiv. 18. Entering into a covenant, Deut. xxix. 12.

of Seth, were eight hundred years: and he begat sons and daughters.

3 So all the days of Adam that he lived, were nine hundred and thirty years: when he died.

That thou shouldst enter INTO COVENANT with the Lord thy God. It was applied by the Hebrews to the PASSOVER, when they came out of Egypt, and accordingly the PASSOVER was instituted in commemoration of the divine goodness, who PASSED over the firstborn in Egypt, and which pointed out the great and last sacrifice at the PASSOVER, when the Messiah came, who was to pardon and PASS over iniquity, transgression and sin. This faith seems to have peculiarly characterized the church in the time of Eber; sacrifices by slaying of animals were observed as types of the coming of the Redeemer. The descendants from Eber, the great grandson of Shem, were called from him Hebrews; a name they have retained to this day. And thus at this period of the world it shewed their firm belief in the coming of the Messiah, who was to pass over, and forgive all those who believed in him, and lived agreeably to his precepts.

The next in the order of primogeniture, is Peleg. Means to divide, therefore it is said, *in his days the earth was divided*. Some have thought that this has relation to the earth; that originally it was in one compact mass, and that at this period of the world it was divided by an earthquake as it is now. But a supposition of this nature cannot be admitted, because it leaves us to conclude that the Divine Being could not foresee what should happen, and therefore that when the time came, he found it necessary to make this division. Leaving such suppositions to those who can be satisfied with them, I shall give a more rational account of this transaction, more consistent with the understanding of the original writer of the sacred scriptures, which treat only concerning things appertaining to religion, and the future state of man.

By the earth, in scripture language, is frequently meant the inhabitants. Gen. vi. 11, *The earth also was corrupt*; —xi. 1, *And the whole earth was of one language*; —xix. 31, *After the manner of all the earth*; 1 Chron. xvi. 23, *Sing unto the Lord all the earth*; Psalm c. *Make a joyful noise unto the Lord, all ye lands*; Dent. xxxii. 1, *Hear, O earth, the words of my mouth*; 1 Kings, x. 24, *and all the earth sought Solomon*. Therefore it is more consistent with enlightened reason, and we have the authority of scripture to conclude, that some other division was meant by the sacred writer. Now as it appears that these names were given by the patriarchs to their descendants to signify the states of these patriarchal churches, it is also as certain that at this time a division was made among them, for a singular change took place in the first order of patriarchs, from Adam to Enoch, who are said to have lived 800 years after the birth of their successor. Thus,

Seth after the birth of Enos.....	507 years.
Enos after the birth of Cainan.....	815
Cainan after the birth of Mahalaleel..	840
Mahalaleel after the birth of Jarad...	830
Jarad after the birth of Enoch.....	800

And that this applies to the ecclesiastical department, or the church, as well as to the patriarchs, may be allowed, because it is said that Enoch walked with God three hundred years after the birth of Methuselah; which is sufficient to convince us that a very considerable change took place in the church in the time of righteous Enoch.

6 ¶ Now Seth lived a hundred and five years: then Enos was born.

7 And Seth lived, after the birth of Enos, eight hundred, and seven years: and he begat sons, and daughters.

Thus it is said of the first five patriarchs, beginning with Seth, by whom the first visible church was manifested, that they lived 800 years after the birth of their firstborn son, to the change which took place in the time of Enoch: even as it is said of the first five patriarchs of the second order from Noah, by whom the second visible church was manifested, that they lived upwards of 400 years only after the birth of their firstborn son, to the change which took place at the time of Peleg.

Noah was 500 years old at the birth of Shem, Ham, and Japheth, Gen. v. 32; but as it is expressly said that he lived 350 years after the flood, ch. ix. 29, and that his three sons were married when they went into the ark, they must have been 50 years old at the time of the flood, which authorizes us to state that after the birth of his firstborn son,

Noah lived.....	400 years.
Shem after the birth of Arphaxad....	500
Arphaxad after the birth of Salah....	403
Salah after the birth of Eber.....	403
Eber after the birth of Peleg.....	430

But that which confirms us in the opinion that the division of the earth in the time of Peleg, was a division of the church is, that from Peleg, to Serug, these patriarchs are said to have lived only half the time of the first five, that is 200 years after the birth of their firstborn son. Thus Peleg lived after the birth of Reu, 209 years; Reu after the birth of Serug, 207 years; Serug after the birth of Nahor, 200 years.

Now if we consider that at this period, the Chaldean empire was extending its conquests over a great part of the east, that the love of dominion when aided by power will not suffer itself to be controlled, it is no wonder that the Chaldean power put an end to this ancient patriarchal-monarchical form of government. We have scripture and history to prove that this division, which took place in the time of Peleg, was a division of the KINGS and the PRIESTLY offices, arising from a general apostasy from the true worship of God; which caused a division in the church; the greatest part, either from compulsion, or from the prevalence of example, adopted the politic worship of the Babylonians, the descendants of Ham. Thus the monarchical form of government, which from the time of Noah had been joined to the ecclesiastical, was now divided; but the priestly patriarchs was still retained in Peleg, and in his descendants down to Serug; like that which now exists in the patriarch of the Greek church at Constantinople, who is considered as a nominal head of that church, but who has not any power as a temporal prince; or like the pope, who is reduced to a similar situation.

Again it is said, that this second race of patriarchs to Serug, who were born after the flood, lived thirty years before the birth of their firstborn son. Thus,

Arphaxad lived 35 years to Salah	
Salah.....	30 years to Eber.
Eber.....	34 years to Peleg.
Peleg.....	30 years to Reu.
Reu.....	32 years to Serug.
Serug.....	30 years to Nahor.

On the first reading, it appears strange that all these patriarchs should be nearly of the same age at the birth of their firstborn sons, and objectors have often brought this forward as an argu-

8 So all the days of Seth; were nine hundred and twelve years: then he died.

9 ¶ Now Enos lived, ninety years: when he begat Cainan.

10 And Enos lived after the birth of Cainan, eight hundred and fifteen years: and he begat sons, and daughters;

11 So all the days of Enos, were nine hundred and five years: then he died.

12 ¶ Now Cainan lived seventy years, when he begat Mahalaleel.

13 And Cainan lived after the birth of Mahalaleel, eight hundred and forty years: and he begat sons, and daughters.

ment against the Bible. But if we attend to the manners, customs, and usages of those ancient people, as mentioned in the sacred scriptures, we shall be satisfied that it was consistent with the order which was established at that day.

It was a custom among the ancient Athenians, not to enter into the marriage state till they were thirty years of age; and since this custom was derived from the ancient Hebrews, every objection to the patriarchs being of the same age when they married must vanish. The number thirty seems to have been particularly attended to by these ancient people, for it appears that they were not permitted to officiate in the priestly office under thirty years of age. This we find to have been the custom in after-ages, Numb. iv. 3, *From thirty years old and upward, even unto fifty years old, all that enter into the host, to do the work in the tabernacle of the congregation.* This custom was observed by Christ, when he began to preach, Matt. iii. 23. Neither does it appear that the patriarchs married above once; and that was at the time when they entered into the ministry, which custom is observed in the Greek church.

Reu succeeded Peleg. The meaning of the word *Reu* is to break, break off, or to break the long established order of things: from which we learn, that as this church departed more and more from the true worship of God, to the time of Nahor, who was an idolater; so we are authorized to conclude that in the time of Reu, the long established order, which had existed from the time of Noah, was broken; and things introduced which were inconsistent with the doctrine and practice of the church in his time; and in the time of those who succeeded him. Until this remarkable period the true worship of God, as established in the time of Noah, was observed, and from the time of Peleg and Reu, the established worship was broken: from whence we are authorized to date the beginning of idolatry in the line of Shem.

Serug his son confirmed this change. The word *Serug* means to wrap together, to be wreathed or twisted together, like the tender branches of a vine, Gen. x. 12; Joel i. 7; which, in conformity with the former state, shews that the church in the time of Serug, continued the separation or division. Thus when the church had fallen into gross errors, they united themselves together with those, who had joined the popular idol-worship.

This appears to have been the very last stage of this ancient patriarchal church, when the true worship of God was not known as a national, or public worship: but instead thereof, idols, and visible representations under the delusive idea of a personification of the attributes and infinite excellencies of a Supreme, were at length worshipped.

14 So all the days of Cainan were nine hundred and ten years: then he died.

15 Now Mahalaleel lived sixty and five years: when he begat Jarad;

16 ¶ And Mahalaleel lived, after the birth of Jarad, eight hundred and thirty years: and he begat sons, and daughters.

17 So all the days of Mahalaleel, were eight hundred, ninety and five years: then he died.

18 ¶ Now Jared lived a hundred sixty and two years: when he begat Enoch.

19 And Jared lived after the birth of Enoch, eight hundred years: and he begat sons, and daughters.

This worship finally obtained among the descendants of Shem, who like the posterity of Ham, the builders of Babel, and the founders of the Babylonish empire, worshipped the same idols. So that the state of things at this period was similar to that at the conclusion of the first patriarchal church; nothing remained of the true worship whereby it could be known what it was in its origin in the time of Noah.

NAMES AND AGES OF THE PATRIARCHS OF THE SECOND ORDER.

	A. M.	Born.	Died.	Age.
Noah.....	1030	2006	950	
Shem.....	1558	2159	600	
Arphaxad.....	1658	2096	438	
Salah.....	1693	2126	433	
Eber.....	1723	2187	464	
Peleg.....	1757	1996	239	
Reu.....	1789	2028	239	
Serug.....	1819	2049	230	
Nahor.....	1848	1996	148	
Terah.....	1878	2083	205	
Abraham.....	2008	2183	175	

This ancient Noahotic church had now come to its final consummation. See Bellamy's History of all Religions.

NOTES ON CHAP. V.

1. This chapter contains an account of the descendants of Adam to the time of Noah. It is said in the day; but it could not be a book of the generations of Adam in the day he was created; it must have reference to time, and not simply day. So we find the word *in years*, which is rendered *day*, signifies time, and which here is applied to the dispensation given to Adam, which ended in the time of Noah. And as this dispensation was the most perfect and sacred of all the dispensations, it is said: *In the day that God created man: in the likeness of God he made him.* That is, by this merciful dispensation, God provided the means, whereby man should again be restored, that he should regain the image and likeness of God, by faith in the Messiah, which he had lost by disobedience to the divine command in Paradise. So that the true meaning appears to be this: This is the genealogy of Adam, in the day, time, or period, of the first dispensation which God gave to Adam, in Paradise, in the likeness of God, in which he was created.

2. And called their name Adam. Hence it appears that *Adam*, is a general term for the human race.

20 So all the days of Jared, were nine hundred, sixty and two years: when he died.

21 ¶ Now Enoch lived; sixty and five years: when he begat Methuselah:

22 Moreover Enoch had walked himself with God, after the birth of Methuselah, three hundred years: and he begat sons, and daughters;

23 So all the days of Enoch, were three hundred, sixty and five years.

24 Thus Enoch walked himself with God: and he departed, for God accepted him.

25 ¶ Now Methuselah lived, an hundred eighty and seven years: when he begat Lamech;

26 And Methuselah lived, after the birth of Lamech; seven hundred, eighty and two years: and he begat sons, and daughters:

27 So all the days of Methuselah, were nine hundred, sixty and nine years: then he died.

28 ¶ Now Lamech lived, an hundred, eighty and two years, and begat a son.

29. *This same shall comfort us, &c.* In the common version we are at a loss to know what was the nature of the consolation which was to be afforded by the Son of Lamech. The reading is also very improper, viz. concerning our work and toil; the words *work*, and *toil*, signify the same thing; it is a repetition, which would not be allowed by any writer or speaker knowing the meaning of words. The word *מַעֲשֵׂה* *va meegnitshon*, rendered *toil*, has two significations; it was used by the sacred writers to signify the worship paid to idols. It occurs Jer. xlv. 19; *to worship her*. But this word is not used simply to signify idolatrous worship; the same root with a variation in the form, as to its prefixes and suffixes, means *grief*, *affliction*, *labour of mind*, Gen. iii. 16, 17, *sorrow*. Prov. x. 10; Job ix. 28; Psa. xvi. 4.—cxvii. 2; Isa. l. 11. This is the primary meaning.

The same radix is also applied to idols; because the worship of idols always brought the worshippers into *distress* and *trouble*. In ch. xlviii. 5, it is said, *אֵלֶּיךָ גָּאֻסְתִּי*, *mine idol*; but in 1 Chron. iv. 10, the same word, both consonants and vowels, is rendered, *it may grieve me*. It must appear evident however, that the same word cannot be both a *noun* and a *verb*. In the plural it is applied to idols: 2 Chron. xxiv. 18; Hos. iv. 17—viii. 4—xiii. 2—xiv. 8. Thus we find that it means to pay adoration by an idol; so in Jer. xlv. 19, which is rendered, *did we make her cakes in worship her*, but which should be, *did we make her cakes* (the queen of heaven) *לְהַגְמִיטֶיהָ* *le hagnatsibah*, for her idol, i. e. the idol by which they paid adoration to the moon. The word in this verse in Genesis, *מַעֲשֵׂה* *va meegnitshon*, I therefore translate agreeably to its primary meaning, thus—*even because of the sorrow*.

The following word *יָדָיו* *yaadeenou*, is translated by, *our hands*; but we have seen that this word has a very extensive application; and retaining the force of the word according to the meaning of the root, it should be rendered in conformity with the obvious meaning of the narrative. Now this passage has no reference to the labour of the hand, but to the *trouble of mind* under which they laboured, because of the oppression of the idolaters, who had nearly overwhelmed the true church. I have rendered it accordingly, as it is also rendered in other

29 And he called his name Noah, saying: Now he will comfort us, concerning our work, even concerning the sorrow of our ministry; for the ground which JEHOVAH cursed.

30 And Lamech lived after the birth of Noah, five hundred, ninety and five years: and he begat sons, and daughters.

31 So all the days of Lamech, were seven hundred, seventy, and seven years: then he died.

32 Now Noah was, five hundred years old: and Noah begat, Shem, Ham, and Japheth.

CHAP. VI.

NOW it was, when man begun to multiply on the face of the ground: and daughters were born to them.

2 When the children of the god, admired the daughters of men, because fair: then they took for them women, from all which they chose.

parts of scripture. See 1 Chron. vi. 13,—*יָדָיו* *yedee*, the service; Ezra iii. 10; Hos. xii. 10, *by the ministry*. This proposition will then truly read, *Now he will comfort us because of our work, even because of the sorrow of our ministry*.

By this translation we have not only proper language, and a consistent sense, but information. The sacred writer gives us a striking picture of the state of the world at that period; and that the church had been informed in the time of Noah, that God would establish the true order of sacrificial worship, and abolish idolatry.

But some may say, admitting this to be the true translation, we are at a loss to know how the words, *sorrow of our ministry*, are to be understood. From the preceding pages we learn that opposition to the established worship had begun at a very early period; and in the following chapter, we find that it had become universal. During the ministration of the eight patriarchs, from Seth to the time of Noah, the church had fallen away; the indulgences allowed to the professors of idolatry, the accumulation of wealth, and the fascinating power of sensual gratification, had infused their baneful poison into the hearts of the whole human race, except the patriarch and his family. So that the *sorrow of the ministry*, arose from the opposition the worshippers of God met with from the idolaters, which in the time of Lamech, had become so oppressive, that God by the communication from the Cherubim, informed him of the change which should take place in the time of Noah.

Because of the ground which the Lord hath cursed. We are here naturally led back to this state of the first people after the Fall; and if the reader turns to what has been said on that subject, ch. iii. 7, it will be found that the first people had departed from the pure state in which God had created them, and had introduced a state of idol or image worship, which passing throughout all the idolatrous nations, finally became extinct in the time of Noah; by whom the dispensation was renewed and established.

NOTES ON CHAP. VI.

2. *Sons of God saw the daughters of men.* By *בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים* *benee Elohim*, translated *sons of God*, is understood the descend-

3 So JEHOVAH said, My spirit shall not strive with man for ever; because that he moreover is flesh: for his time shall be, an hundred and twenty years.

4 The Apostates were on the earth in those days; and also after that time, when the sons of

God came to the daughters of Adam; who bare to them: these were the mighty, yea of old, men of name.

5 ¶ Now JEHOVAH beheld, the great wickedness of man on earth: for he had formed every imagination of his heart, only of evil, all the day.

ants of Seth, the true worshippers; or in scripture language, the sons of God; who joined the idolatrous descendants of Cain. Thus these descendants of Seth having acquired power by joining the popular worship of idols, came to the daughters of Adam, those who yet remained of the true worshippers.

It is plain that this race of men, who filled the earth with violence, were condemned by God, and that they were destroyed for their wickedness; consequently could not according to the right use of the term be sons of God. Idolatry was so universal, that we find Noah and his family only accepted, among the descendants of Seth; therefore the posterity of Cain, and the apostates from the other branches of Adam, must at this period have been very numerous, to have gained over to their idol worship, almost the whole population. So that we have sufficient authority in the common version, for concluding, that these descendants of Seth, were those called the sons of God; who on account of their superiority in point of numbers, exercised great tyranny among the descendants of Seth; by taking wives of all they chose. And by this plan, not only put a stop to the increase of the true worshippers of God among the descendants of Adam, by Seth, among whom the true church was established; but also at length made idolatry the universal profession. Therefore by the daughters of Adam we understand the worshippers of the true God, until they were obliged by being connected with the idolaters, to worship idols with them.

I shall depend on the authority of scripture for this variation in the application; for we find where this word is to be understood in the superlative degree, it should always be understood to relate to the highest, or the most eminent of the subjects spoken of. The subject introduced here is respecting the great men of that day, who thus indulged themselves in selecting from the daughters of Adam, whoever they chose. My authority therefore for applying the words בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים *benne ha Elohyim*, the sons of God, to the descendants of Seth, is consistent with scripture, which never styles idolaters sons of God. But these were truly so called, they were brought up in the true worship, and apostatized; agreeably to the first clause of this verse. These sons of God, came in unto the daughters of Adam, and they bare children unto them. Which proves, that these men, called sons of God, were mortal men, and sons of the great men of that day, who worshipped the idol.

The word אֱלֹהִים *Elohyim*, always means God, or an idol worshipped as God. I will shew the distinction. When the word אֱלֹהִים *Elohyim*, means God, it is connected with such operations as can only be applicable to him. But when it is applied to an idol, the word, or the word qualified by it, has a minor, as in this case; וַיִּרְאוּ *va yiraou*, and they saw, has the minor *Ith*, the minor of *Katon*. See also ch. xxx. 8; Jon. iii. 3.

Thus it was applied to that which was esteemed the god, or the most high, worshipped as God, and resident among men; which yet was acknowledged a minor compared with him. And it is in such case connected with such operations as are only proper to men. This shews the necessity of attending to the accentual reading, called by the learned Buxtorf, "a most

important branch of Hebrew learning, so absolutely necessary to obtain a true understanding of the sacred writings, which had been so far neglected, that the Jews knew little concerning its real use." Indeed Jews have no advantage above Christians in acquiring a knowledge of the language, for they are generally guided by the vulgar translations in every Christian nation; without endeavouring to enter into a critical examination of the original, consistently with ancient usage.

3. For that he also is flesh. There has, with great propriety, been many objections made to the received translation of this verse; but when the Hebrew is literally rendered, it obviates the objections, and will satisfy the critic. The word בָּשָׂר *bi-shagom*, is rendered, for that he also: but the speaker is God, and the translation makes it appear, that God is flesh. It is a compound word—which assigns a reason for the judgment which God was bringing on the earth; on account of the iniquity of man. The worship of nature had become the popular worship among the great mass of pretenders to wisdom—a refined order of worship. They were not content with the pure and rational worship of the beneficent CREATOR; and yet, notwithstanding, we find that one in the family of the patriarch introduced the idol abomination after the flood. The word בָּשָׂר *basar*, so applied, means a state completely absorbed in all sensuality. Ezek. xvi. 26;—xxiii. 20.

4. There were giants in the earth in those days. The word עַלְמָיִם *hanphilim*, has by the translators been understood to mean magnitude of stature; but it signifies to fall, to apostatize, apostasies. It is from the root נָפַל *naphal*, Mich. vii. 8, I fell; Jud. xv. 18, and shall I fall; 2 Kings xxv. 11, fell away. It is applied to those who apostatized from the worship of God, and these *nephilim*, these apostates, are said to have been from old time; i. e. the descendants of Cain: for the words old time, refer to the antediluvian state of things. By the words עַלְמָיִם *anshee hasheem*, men of name; is understood the title they had taken, calling themselves, the sons of the God, viz. the offspring of Cain, who being the firstborn of men, was no doubt worshipped by this fallen race. The Septuagint translate the word by γίγαντες; *gigantes*, which means earthborn; but the translators, without attending to the original word, have translated it, by giants; and thus have mistaken men of high rank, and great in power, for magnitude of stature. We cannot therefore blame objectors who have said, "This shews what fabulous notions were entertained concerning giants." It will however convince the learned, that it is absolutely necessary to attend to the original Hebrew, if we mean to have a true knowledge of scripture. We also learn, as I have before stated, that the translators, and revisors, have followed the Greek and the Vulgate, which accounts for the errors in all the modern translations.

5. Yeezer, means here an effort of the mind to form the thought. A more complete picture of the fallen state of man, could not have been drawn; the whole man was evil, evil only; not for a short time, but all the day.

6. The Lord repented. This part of the history has been for ages resorted to by the enemies of revelation, to prove that the Hebrew lawgiver did not write by inspiration, because it must

6 Yet JEHOVAH was satisfied that he had made the man on the earth: notwithstanding he idolized himself, at his heart.

be allowed that repentance cannot be applied to God; he who is all perfection cannot do any thing to repent of. This is undoubtedly true, and by a strict attention to the original Hebrew, we shall find that no such notion can be entertained of God.

There are two words in this verse which have been misunderstood, and misapplied by the translators. The word *וַיִּנְחֵם* *yinaachem*, they have rendered, *IT REPENTED*; there certainly is no word for the neuter pronoun, *it*; if translators had attended to the true reading of this word, they would have found that throughout the scriptures it means, *to comfort*, *to be satisfied*, *appeased*; and all the words are applicable that imply a state of *comfort*, or *consolation*, on account of something having taken place which brings the mind into a state of *comfort* and *peace*. Such as, *to strengthen*, *to enliven*, *to invigorate*, *to countenance*, *to assist*, *to support* the mind under calamity.

Therefore, the most effectual way of silencing all objections to this translation in future, will be to shew, that this word having the same form, both consonants and vowels, is translated by the word *comfort*, in the common versions, and that in all those places where it has been rendered *repent*; it will appear, not only more consistent with reason, but perfectly conformable to the narratives, to render it by *comfort*, or *to be satisfied*.

In Gen. xxxviii. 12, we have the same word, both consonants and vowels, which is there translated right, viz. *וַיִּנְחֵם* *yinaachem*, and he was comforted. That is, Judah was comforted. See also 1 Sam. xii. 14, *And David comforted*.

Again Gen. i. 21, *And he comforted*; also ch. xxiv. 67, *And he was comforted*. Also the plural, Job xlii. 11, *Then came unto him all his brethren, and all his sisters and comforted him*; Ezek. xxxi. 16, *and shall be comforted*. Now as it cannot be said, that Judah *repented*, that David *repented*, that Joseph *repented*, when he consoled his brethren; that Isaac *repented* when he married Rebekah, or that the brethren of Job *repented* when they comforted him: so neither can it be said, that God *repented* that he had made man.

I now refer the reader to the following passages, where the same word is translated erroneously by *repent*, but which will be seen to read with far greater propriety, agreeably to the true import of the word, by *comforted*, *consoled*.

If we take *וַיִּנְחֵם* *nicham*, under the form of the third person singular preter, we shall find that it uniformly has the same meaning as above. See Isa. xlix. 13, *the Lord hath comforted*; —li. 3, *the Lord shall (hath) comforted*; —li. 9, *the Lord hath comforted*; 2 Sam. xiii. 39, *he was comforted*.

But there are two places, where the translators have rendered this very same word, by *he repented*. See Amos vii. 3, *the Lord repented*, and the same in the 6th verse. In the 1st and 2nd verses the prophet was informed that Judgment had taken place in the land, on account of the great declension from the worship of God. At the intercession of the prophet, on account of the rise of Jacob, viz. *by whom shall Jacob arise?* by which was understood the true and ancient priesthood of Jacob; the priesthood of the firstborn, or the Melchizedekian priesthood, to be accomplished by the Messiah: the answer was, *it shall not be, saith the Lord*. Thus Amos and the people received *comfort*, and these two passages truly read, *Jehovah comforted concerning this*. Not that he *repented* for this, which would be representing the Eternal, as though subject to all the passions of man; and he with whom the future is present, as not knowing

7 Then JEHOVAH said, I will destroy the man, whom I have created from the face of the ground; even man with beast, and reptile, also

to day, what shall take place tomorrow. Thus does the true translation agree with the history, which shews that this word does not mean to *repent*; consequently that no such passion can possibly be applied to God.

Again Jer. xv. 6, *וַיִּנְחֵם* *hinaachem*; another variation of the same verb is rendered, in connection with the preceding verb, *I am weary of repenting*; but it truly reads, *I am weary of comforting*. See where the same word is translated in the common version, *to be comforted*, Psa. lxxvii. 2; and with *וַיִּנְחֵם* prefixed, Jer. xxxi. 13.

In Jer. xxvi. 19, this word is erroneously translated, *and the Lord repented him*. In the first place, to say *the Lord repented him*, is incorrect; the language is bad. Secondly, the pronoun singular, *him*, is not in the original of this word: but as it is the same, both consonants and vowels, as the one under consideration, in the 6th verse of this chapter; and as both these are the same, both consonants and vowels, as in ch. xxxviii. 12, where it is truly translated, *and Judah was comforted*; it is incontrovertibly evident, that in the above two verses, viz. Gen. vi. 6, and Jer. xxvi. 19, this word should be so translated. For there would be no certainty in a language, if the selfsame word had a contrary sense in another part of scripture; it cannot mean *comfort* in one place, and *repent* in another: we shall however be led to a true translation of this passage, Jer. xxvi. 19.

If the reader will turn to 2 Kings xix. he will find, that when the enemies of Israel threatened Jerusalem with destruction, that the prophet was commanded to go to Hezekiah the king, and to assure him that the Assyrians should not come into the city, nor shoot an arrow there. Thus God *comforted* them, by promising a deliverance from their enemies.

The word *וַיִּנְחֵם* *el*, requires to be translated as it is in other parts of scripture, with the same construction, by *concerning*, viz. *concerning the evil*. Not that God *repented*, but that God *comforted*. The clause truly reads, *Jehovah comforted concerning the evil*; which is consistent with the whole narrative, and with the above passage, ch. xxxviii. 12, where the very same word is translated, *Judah was comforted*.

In Joel ii. 13, *וַיִּנְחֵם* *ve nichaam*, is rendered, *and repent*: but as the word *וַיִּנְחֵם* *yaashob*, immediately precedes, which means to *turn*, it follows, that *nichaam*, cannot be translated *repent*: as the word to turn plainly means a reconciliation on the part of God. The clause reads, *Who knoweth if he will return, and comfort*. Which is in conformity with the following part of the chapter, where they were promised abundance of spiritual and temporal good. The same clause occurs in Jonah iii. 9.

In Job xlii. 6, *וַיִּנְחֵם* *ve nichamti*, is translated, *and repent*: The sufferings of Job were now past, he here acknowledged the providence of God, who had *comforted* him when he sat in dust and ashes. The clause reads, *FOR I SHALL BE COMFORTED*. That is, he was sensible that God supported him, and that he should be comforted in all his troubles.

Jer. xxvi. 3, *that I may repent me*; Heb. *Then I will comfort*, i. e. *concerning the evil*.

Ezek. xxiv. 14, *Neither will I repent*, this is understood in the preceding verb; *neither will I spare*, for to spare, would imply something like repentance. The clause reads, *neither will I comfort*.

Exod. xxxii. 12, *Turn from thy fierce wrath*, *וַיִּנְחֵם* *ve hinaachem*, WITH COMFORT concerning the evil toward thy people. That this is the true reading is evident, as observed; for

with the bird of the heaven: yet I am satisfied, that I made them.

8 But Noah found favour, in the eyes of JEHOVAH.

וַיָּשׁוּב, to return, precedes, and as returning implies a change of state, therefore he returned with comfort.

Isaiah xl. 1. We have another form of the verb נָחַם נָחַם nacheamou nacheamou, comfort ye, comfort ye.

Psalms cx. 4. The Lord hath sworn and will not repent. It has been asked, If the verb in Gen. vi. 6, means, satisfied, consoled, or comforted; how can it be said here, The Lord hath sworn and will not be satisfied? This is a prophecy concerning the coming of the Messiah, and under his government, the Psalmist was speaking of the great increase and glory of the church, that for numbers they should be compared with the

1 Sam. xv. 29. ... נָחַם נָחַם Lehinacheem—That he should repent. N. T. To be comforted.

Jer. xxi. 15. ... נָחַם נָחַם To be comforted.

Here we find that the very same word both consonants and vowels, which is rendered in the above passage of Samuel, that he should repent, is in Jer. xxi. 15, translated, to be comforted, which is another incontrovertible proof that this word should be so translated throughout the scripture.

Isaiah i. 24. ... נָחַם נָחַם Enacheem, I will ease me of mine adversaries, and avenge me of mine enemies. I know of no difference between an adversary, and an enemy. Nor is there any difference in sense between getting rid by force of adversaries, and in being avenged on enemies. There is no authority for the word me, consequently נָחַם enacheem, cannot be translated, I will ease me. This word is the first person singular future, and literally reads, shall I comfort, and נָחַם נָחַם, my enemies. The first clause is interrogatory. Heb. Shall I comfort my adversaries? Yea, I will be avenged on my enemies.

Ezek. xxiv. 14. ... נָחַם נָחַם Neither will I repent. N. T. Neither will I comfort.

Isaiah lvii. 6. ... נָחַם נָחַם Should I receive comfort.

Here again the same word is translated comfort, which in the two preceding passages is rendered repent. And in the last passage, the comfort is applied to God, viz. Should I receive comfort in these? The clause reads, concerning these shall I be satisfied?

Jud. xxi. 16. ... נָחַם נָחַם Nicham—And the people repented them. N. T. Thus the people was comforted, concerning Benjamin, though, &c. The reader will observe the impropriety of the expressions, it repented them; it repented him; repented thee; it repented me.

Two errors are made here, the neuter pronoun it, is supplied, which cannot be allowed, because it is not understood; and the pronouns them, him, me, never occur in this word, in the original. נָחַם Gram, people, is a collective noun singular.

Jer. viii. 6. ... נָחַם נָחַם Nicham. No man repented him. N. T. No man comforteth because of his wickedness.

Jonah iv. 2. ... נָחַם נָחַם Venicham. And repented thee. N. T. And comfortest concerning.

Jud. xi. 18. ... נָחַם נָחַם Yinaacheem. For it repented the Lord. N. T. Then Jehovah comforted because of their groanings.

Exod. xiii. 17. ... נָחַם נָחַם Naacham, because the people will repent. N. T. Will be consoled.

1 Sam. xv. 29. ... נָחַם נָחַם Nor repent. N. T. Neither will he be appeased.

Psa. cx. 4. ... נָחַם נָחַם And will not repent. N. T. And will he not comfort?

This is a prophecy of the coming of Messiah, and the comfort which was to be administered under his dispensation, by the abolition of sacrificial worship, and thus opening a new and living way into the Holy of Holies. The Psalmist firmly believed in the promise, and he confirmed his faith by an interrogative; viz. and will he not comfort?

Job xxix. 25. ... נָחַם נָחַם comforteth—he comforteth. Thus we see, that this word, which in the three former passages, is translated, repent, and repented; is here translated, agreeably to its true meaning, comforteth: which is sufficient authority for rendering them accordingly.

Exod. xxxii. 12. ... נָחַם נָחַם Vekinaachem. Turn from thy fierce wrath, and repent. N. T. Turn from thy fierce wrath, and comfort concerning the evil.

See on Jer. xxxi. 19, above, where I have shewn, that נָחַם should means a change of action in consequence of a change of mind in man.

Psa. xc. 13. ... נָחַם נָחַם And let it repent thee. N. T. And cause comfort because of thy servants. There is not any authority in the Hebrew, for the words, let it, nor is there any pronoun thee in the word, נָחַם vekinaachem.

Exod. xxxii. 14. ... נָחַם נָחַם Vayinaachem. And the Lord repented. N. T. So Jehovah was satisfied concerning the evil.

2 Sam. xxiv. 16. ... נָחַם נָחַם And he repented. N. T. Then Jehovah was satisfied concerning the evil.

1 Chron. xxi. 15. ... נָחַם נָחַם And he repented him. N. T. And he was satisfied concerning the evil.

Psa. cvi. 45. ... נָחַם נָחַם And repented. N. T. And was satisfied.

Jer. xxvi. 19. ... נָחַם נָחַם And the Lord repented him. N. T. Then Jehovah was satisfied concerning the evil.

Jon. iii. 10. ... נָחַם נָחַם And God repented. N. T. Then God was satisfied concerning the evil.

The following different forms of the verb, which are erroneously translated in the common version, contrasted with the new translation.

1 Sam. xv. 35. ... נָחַם נָחַם Nicham. And the Lord repented. N. T. Yet Jehovah was consoled though he had made Saul king.

Jer. xx. 16. ... נָחַם נָחַם And repented not. N. T. And comforted not.

9 These were the generations of Noah; Noah was a just man, upright in his generation: Noah himself walked with God.

10 Now Noah begat three sons: Shem, Ham, and Japheth.

11 But the earth was corrupt before the presence of God: yea injustice filled the earth.

12 Now God looked on the earth, and behold, it was depraved: because all flesh had caused the corruption of his way, on the earth.

- i Sam. xv. 11. נִחַמְתִּי *Nichanti*. *It repenteth me*. N. T. *I was consoled when I set*. He was consoled at the time they rejected Samuel, and he gave them Saul.
- Jer. iv. 28. *I will not repent*. N. T. *I have not consoled*. The verb is in the preter tense.
- xxxi. 19. *I repented*. N. T. *I was comforted*; i. e. *After that I turned, I was comforted*. Here it is plain that this word means to *comfort*, for Ephraim must have repented when he turned, and when he had turned, or when he had repented, for נִחַמְתִּי *shanti*, to turn, is the proper word for a change of action; then he *comforted*, in consequence of repentance in man. He could not turn first and repent afterwards.
- Jer. xlii. 10. *I repented me*. N. T. *I am satisfied concerning the evil*.
- Zach. viii. 14. *I repented not*. N. T. *I comforted not*.
- Jer. xviii. 8. נִחַמְתִּי *Nichanti*. *I will repent*. N. T. *Then I shall be satisfied*.
- 10. *Then I will repent*. N. T. *Then I shall be satisfied*.
- xxvi. 3. *That I may repent me*. N. T. *Then I shall be satisfied*.
- xxxi. 13. *And will comfort them*. It is translated *comfort*.
- Jud. xxi. 6. נִחַמְתִּי *Nichanti*. *And the children of Israel repented them*. Heb. *Now the children of Israel were comforted*. See the preceding verses; they were comforted, not because they had almost cut off the tribe of Benjamin by war, which war appears to have been begun on the ground of justice; but because they had resolved to take the daughters of the inhabitants of Jabesh-gilead, for wives for Benjamin, to restore the tribe. The word *them*, does not occur in the original.
- Ezek. xxxi. 16. *Shall be comforted*. In these two passages this word which is the same in the original, is translated differently in the common version. In the first to *repent*; in the second to *comfort*; which last, as before observed, is its true meaning, and shews, that it cannot be translated by the word *repent*.
- Deut. xxxii. 36. נִחַמְתִּי *Nichanti*. *And repent himself for his servants*. It appears altogether inapplicable, and without meaning, how God could *repent himself for his servants*. The clause reads, *but concerning his servants, he will satisfy himself*. The same verse occurs, Psa. cxlvi. 14.
- Numb. xxiii. 19. נִחַמְתִּי *Nichanti*. *That he should repent*. It is necessary to examine this verse particularly. The common version says, *God is not a man that he should lie*. The word נִחַמְתִּי *nikameh*, is rendered, *that he should lie*; but the reader should always remember that there is no subjunctive mood in Hebrew; consequently the word *should*, in the common version of this word, cannot be admitted. The word is the third person singular future; it is not applied to God, as in the common version, viz. *that he (God) should lie*; but it is applied to man, and literally reads, *God is not man, for he will lie*. It then follows, in the common version, *neither the son of man that he should repent*: here we find that these two verbs, נִחַמְתִּי *nikameh*, *that he should lie*; and נִחַמְתִּי *nikameh*, *that he should repent*, are both put in the same conjugation: whereas, the first is in the Piel conjugation, and the other in Hithpacl; which last, should have been translated, *for he will console himself*. That is, like the first verb, it is applied to man, not to God, as in the common version. It is applied to Balaam. *God had put a word in the mouth of Balaam*, ver. 16, with a charge to deliver it to Balak; viz. *for he will console himself*; viz. with the idolatry of Baal, that he should be able in the high places of Baal, to prevail on Balaam to curse Israel. Hence by the error made in the conjugations of these verbs, a direct contrary application of them is made in the common version, where they are applied to God, instead of man.
- Hos. xiii. 14. נִחַמְתִּי *Nichanti*. *Repentance shall be hid from mine eyes*. N. T. *Consolation shall be hid from mine eyes*.
- xi. 8. נִחַמְתִּי *Nichanti*. *My repentings*. N. T. *My consolations*.

The remaining passages where this word occurs throughout the scriptures, are upwards of sixty; in every one of which, it is uniformly translated agreeably to its original meaning by, *comfort, comforted*, as a verb; and by, *comforts, comforter, comforters, consolation, consolations*, as a noun. In many places I have shewn above, that the very same word, both consonants and vowels, which, in the common version, is translated by *repent, repented*; is also in the common version translated by *comfort, comforted*; and where the translators have mistaken the tenses and persons of the verb, where they have translated the same word.

See the following passages, where the same word is translated in the preter and in the future—to comfort, and to repent. *It repented*, Jud. ii. 18, and, *will he repent*, Psa. cx. 4.

Repented them, Jud. xxi. 6, and, *shall be comforted*, Ezek. xxxi. 16. *Hath comforted*, Isa. xlix. 13, and, *will comfort*, Isa. li. 3. *Repenteth him*, Joel ii. 13; *Repentest thee*, Jon. iv. 2; *I will repent*, Jer. iv. 28; *I repented*, ch. xxxi. 19; and, *I repent me*, ch. xlii. 10. In these last three passages, we have the self-same word translated in the common version, as the *past, present, and future*; which is contrary to the philology of the Hebrew, and of all languages.

Now as the words *comfort*, and *repent*, with any modification whatever, cannot be applied to him who is perfection in the absolute; who changed not, Mal. iii. 6, consequently who never did any thing at one time, and repented that he had done it at another; who cannot repent, because he is the fountain of all comfort, consolation, and tranquillity: it follows, that a

13 ¶ Then God said to Noah, The end of all flesh is come in my presence; for injustice filleth the earth, before their face: now I will cause them to be destroyed, on the earth.

state of perfect tranquillity, is to be perfectly satisfied. Thus God was satisfied with his last and best work, when he had created man—when he had created man, he declared, all that he had made was, טוב ממש *tob mēd, superlatively good.*

Surely it is a reproach to all the Christian nations to see the errors of the early ages still retained in the sacred pages. It shows that neither the translators before, nor at the time of Jerome, nor the revisers in the time of James, when the last revision was made, were sufficiently impressed with the hallowed character of the awful Majesty of heaven; or they would not have represented the omniscient Jehovah, with whom there is no future, as not knowing in the space of a few years, that he should repent, because he had made man on the earth, and that it should grieve him at his heart.

The next word is נחמתי *naḥamti*, which the translators have rendered, and it grieved him; the same error is committed here, the neuter pronoun *it*, is again introduced, with another error, viz. the pronoun of the third person *him*, for which there is no authority in the Hebrew. We are not to suppose that God is a changeable being; or that he possesses passions and affections like man. Three serious errors have been made in the translation of this word, and a fourth in its application; it is in the Hithpael conjugation, consequently it cannot be said either as it respects God or man, that it grieved him at his heart. Secondly the word נחמתי *naḥamti*, is made the nominative to the verb, which makes it appear that God was grieved to the heart; whereas the word אדם *Adam, man*, the proximate noun, is the nominative to the verb, and not the remote noun, Jehovah. So that there are five essential errors in this verse, which altogether alter the meaning and application. This word is applied to idols, and to idolatrous worship in a primary sense; and in a secondary sense to mean a grievous state of mind in consequence of having departed from the worship of the true God, to that of idols. Because, says Taylor, instead of succour and relief, the worship of idols always brought grief and distress to the worshippers. The passages where the root of this word is applied by the sacred writers to worship, and idols, are many. Isa. xlviii. 5, mine idol; Jer. xxii. 28, idols; Hos. iv. 17, idols; ch. xiv. 8; 2 Chron. xxiv. 18, Zach. xiii. 2, idols; Ps. cxxxv. 15, the idols; cvi. 38, unto idols; cxxxix. 24, wicked way; Jer. xlv. 19, to worship her; so that the words should be translated notwithstanding he worshipped, or idolized himself. And the verse reads; yet Jehovah was satisfied that he had made man on the earth; though he idolized himself at his heart.

7. It repenteth me. In this verse נחמתי *naḥamti*, is rendered, in the English version, it repenteth me. The same reasons apply here as in the last verse, where no word occurs to give any authority for introducing the neuter pronoun *it*, and the verb has the same ideal meaning as it has above. It is the first person singular preter, and is truly translated, I am satisfied, and the clause reads, yet I am satisfied that I made them.

9. Noah walked with God. The verb הלך *hithaleke*, is in the Hithpael conjugation, and should be translated accordingly, viz. Noah himself walked with God. This then is in conformity with the whole narrative, for all the world had fallen into the worship of idols: there only remained Noah himself, with his family, as the visible head of the true church of God.

14 Make for thee, an ark of the wood of Gopher; rooms thou shalt make in the ark: for thou shalt expiate in it, even a house, also with an outer room for atonement.

9. And perfect. See ch. vii. 1.

It is not only said that Noah was just and upright in the sight of men, but that he walked with God; walked himself, not only externally, but in this conjugation the reflexive verb means, that he walked with God, or worshipped God in his heart, in his affections.

11. The earth was corrupt before God. No regard for the worship of God, they were corrupt even before the altar; which is meant by the presence of God, as it should be rendered. Now it appears that Noah and his family were the only persons who worshipped God in sincerity, among the whole race of antediluvians. The two words, *was*, and *with*, do not occur in the original; the clause reads far more elegantly without them. The idiom of our language requires a transposition of the word בשר *chaamaus*, injustice.

The earth was filled with violence. The word בשר *chaamaus*, which is translated violence, means, to be unrighteous in things appertaining to the worship of God. But we are not told in any of the translations, what was the nature of the violence here mentioned, whether of a civil, or of a religious kind. Great violence has been done in the earth since that period, perhaps as great as ever was done by the antediluvians; and no judgment has followed on account of such violence: so that the translation is indefinite, it has no certain application. I have therefore translated the word as I find it applied by the sacred writers, to signify a confirmed state of irreligion. Job xvi. 17, injustice; ch. xix. 7, wrong; 1 Chron. xii. 17, Exod. xxxii. 1, unrighteous. Hence we find that the sin of the old world consisted in a rooted enmity to the worship of God; they had given themselves up to gross idolatry, which admitted of every species of sensuality.

12. And behold it was corrupt. We have been told in the preceding verse that the earth was corrupt; therefore there was no necessity to be told again immediately that the earth was corrupt. The sacred writer here refers to the consummation of that age, when God sent forth his judgment on that people; and therefore the וְנָמָה *venamah*, which is rendered as a conjunction copulative, and, viz. and God looked; should have been rendered by when, viz. when God saw. The following, 13th verse, is then introduced with great effect, viz. When God looked—Then God said.

13. With the earth. This conveys an idea as if the earth were also destroyed, but נאלץ *nal ha arets*, is, upon the earth.

14. Pitch it within and without with pitch. This passage has often arrested the attention of readers in general. When we consider the vast population of the world at this period, no doubt far greater than it has ever been since, among whom it is probable that the arts and sciences were at least in as great perfection as they are in the present day, if we judge from facts; as they were enabled to construct a ship of such an astonishing magnitude; Isay it has often surprised the biblical reader, and it has been a subject of great triumph for the objectors to divine revelation, that in an age when such a stupendous work could be done, it should have been necessary for Noah to have been told, by divine communication, to do one of the most trifling things in this great work, viz. to pitch it within and without with pitch.

15 Now thus, thou shalt construct it: three hundred cubits, the length of the ark; fifty cubits, the breadth; and thirty cubits, the height of it.

16 A window thou shalt make to the ark,

Light and darkness cannot differ more than the Hebrew differs from the English, and all the translations. There is also an obvious impropriety in language to say, *pitch it with pitch*. We shall find that this very clause introduces subjects which have been passed over by all the translators; subjects which carry great holiness and dignity with them; inseparable from that order which God had established, embracing his incomprehensibly great mercy to man, when he condescended to commune with him from the mercy-seat between the Cherubim; pointing out the way to the tree of life, by *sacrifice and atonement*. We shall find that in this clause, instead of Noah's being informed that he was to *PITCH the ark within and without with pitch*, God commands him to build apartments in the ark, for *SACRIFICE AND ATONEMENT*.

This error was made in the early age of the Christian church; and therefore in answer to the observations of those who say: If this passage contain an account of things so different from the vulgar translations, comprehending the substance of the dispensation from the fall; as representative of the coming of Messiah; and of the abolition of the representative order of things by *sacrifice and atonement*, when that divine person made his appearance—how is it, that for the long period of sixteen hundred years, these things have not been known?

It will be remembered, that when the Messiah came, who agreeably to the declarations of all the prophets, was to cause the representative worship to cease, and the Hebrews were to remain no longer a nation; that his divine dispensation might be promulgated over the world: I say it will be recollected, that at this eventful period, the Hebrews were dispersed into all nations, which was foretold by the sacred writer fifteen hundred years before, should take place at the coming of the Messiah. And as the Hebrew language was only known to the Jews, Christians were obliged to obtain the best translation of the sacred volume they could to settle their faith. For the ancient oracles, containing the *law* and the *testimony*, were referred to by him, for proof that all the prophecies, all that was written in the books of Moses, in the Psalms, and in the prophets, concerning him, as the bruiser of the serpent—the Lord of David—the Immanuel—the Redeemer of Israel, and the Messenger of the covenant; was accomplished by him. Therefore soon after the dispersion of the Jews into all nations, this great work was attempted by Aquila, about the 128th year, who was followed by Theodotion and Symmachus.

It is reasonable therefore to conclude that these translations were very imperfect, for the reasons above given. In this state the sacred truths remained in a great degree covered with the veil of error, till the time of Jerome in the fourth century, when he endeavoured, with the assistance of a Jew who did not understand the Latin language, to amend the earlier versions.

How far he succeeded in removing the errors of the first translators, we all are judges; for from the copy of Jerome, the Latin Vulgate made its appearance; and from this contaminated fountain, all the European translations have been made. The authority of popes, the decrees of councils, the terror of the inquisition, and the power of the sword, have shut up the ark of God; and the representative worship which had respect to the glorious truths of Messiah and his kingdom, have been overwhelmed by the mighty deluge of ignorance, bigotry,

moreover of a cubit thou shalt finish it at the summit; and the door of the ark, thou shalt place at the side of it: lower, second and third stories thou shalt make it.

and superstition—for sixteen centuries no translation of the sacred scriptures has been made from the original Hebrew only. Even in the reigns of Elizabeth and James, when the old translation was revised, no appeal was made to the Hebrew verity, the true word of God; the translations only were resorted to, and the Latin Vulgate they made the modern standard of the sacred oracles. This therefore is the reason why such inconsistencies and contradictions are still retained, which serve only to disgrace the sacred book, and to aid the cause of infidelity.

Rooms shalt thou make in the ark. The word *קִימִין* *kinim*, which is translated *rooms*, has been applied to mean the three divisions of the whole interior of the ark. But this is an error, for the sacred writer has mentioned the three divisions in the 16th verse, viz. *lower, second, and third stories*. *קִימִין* *kinim*, means a place of happiness arising from security, and is here applied to the two rooms, which Noah was commanded to make, where the Cherubim, the ark, and mercy seat, were placed in the innermost *kinim*, room, for expiation, when the priest went within the veil with the blood of the sacrifice: and the outermost *kinim*, was where the altar was placed for the sacrifice. These two *kinims* were a continuation of the holy, and most holy place, and therefore properly called *kinims*; because the transgressors who presented their offerings, with a sincere heart, were accepted; and were thus, according to the meaning of the word, brought into a state of happiness, and security. The atonement offering was brought by the offerer; but it did not follow because he conformed and brought the offering, that his sin was expiated. There was no expiation without acceptance before the mercy-seat, and which was not known till the priest with the incense, and the fire of the altar, entered the Holy of Holies, and presented the sinner before God, who then answered from the Cherubim.

Having thus shewn the meaning and use of the two rooms called *kinim*, viz. that they were set apart for the worship of God, to perpetuate the sacrificial worship as representative of the coming of the Messiah, I now proceed to examine the last clause; *pitch it within and without with pitch*. The word *קֹפֶר* *kopher*, which the translators have rendered *pitch*, has no such meaning; and excepting this solitary verse, it is not translated by *pitch*, in any part of the Bible. The word which is always used, and which is the proper word for *pitch*, is *זֶפֶת* *zepheth*, see Isa. xxiv. 9, *And the streams thereof shall be turned into pitch*; Exod. ii. 3, *And daubed it with slime and with pitch*.

The word *קֹפֶר* *kopher*, throughout the scriptures, is used to mean, *expiation, atonement, reconciliation*; Ezek. xlv. 20, *So shall ye reconcile*; Numb. viii. 19, 1 Chron. vi. 49, *And to make an atonement*; Dan. ix. 24, *And to make reconciliation*; Exod. xxix. 3, *When thou hast made an atonement*. It also as a noun, means, *ransom, atonement, satisfaction*. That this is the true meaning of the word *קֹפֶר* *kopher*, and that it cannot possibly have any other, is confirmed in every other part of scripture where it occurs. See where the very same word, that is, with the same consonants and vowels, is so translated even in the common version: Exod. xxx. 12; Job xxxiii. 24; Prov. vi. 30; Isa. xliii. 3; *satisfaction*, Numb. xxxv. 31, 32. This being the radical meaning of the word, so used, and constantly applied by the sacred writers; I have accordingly translated it, as it is understood and applied in other parts of scripture. This not

17 And I, behold I bring even the deluge of water, upon the earth; to destroy all flesh, wherein is the breath of life; from under the heaven: all that is on the earth, shall expire.

18 But I establish my covenant, with thee: for thou shalt come into the ark; thou, and thy sons, with thy wife and the wives of thy sons, with thee.

19 Even of all that live among all flesh, two from all, thou shalt bring into the ark, to preserve with thee: male and female, they shall be.

20 Of the bird after their kind, and from the

cattle after their kind; of every reptile of the ground, after his kind: two from all shall come to thee, to preserve life.

21 Moreover take thou to thee, of all food that is eaten; also thou shalt gather for thyself: which shall be for thee and for them, for food.

22 Then Noah prepared: according to all that God had commanded him, so he provided.

CHAP. VII.

MOREOVER JEHOVAH said to Noah; Enter thou, with all thy house, into the ark: for

only relieves us from the incongruous expression, *pitch it with pitch*; but we are informed that the dispensation given to Adam after the fall, and continued in all the churches to the time of Noah, was preserved by him in the ark; where sacrifices were offered, during the time that the deluge was on the earth, and the divine communication was given, as in the churches before the flood; from the mercy-seat between the Cherubim; which communication was never given, BUT WHEN THE SACRIFICE FOR ATONEMENT WAS UPON THE ALTAR, AS REPRESENTATIVE OF THE MESSIAH. And therefore the word *kopher*, can have no other meaning in this verse, than it has in every other part of scripture; viz. *Expiation by atonement, ransom, satisfaction, or redemption*; evidently referring to the Messiah, the great high priest of this last dispensation, who is passed into the heaven of heavens: who is said to be, *The propitiation for our sins*, 1 John ii. 4; *Who hath put away sin by the sacrifice of himself*, Heb. ix. 26; *Who also maketh intercession for us*, Rom. viii. 34, before the seat of eternal mercy, of which the earthly mercy-seat was only a figure.

I shall now refer the reader to the intermediate words in this clause, *וּבְיָמֶיךָ אֹתָהָּ מִלִּיִּיתִי*, *milayith*. These words are rendered only by the word *within*. *וּבְיָמֶיךָ*, *Othah*, is a compound word, of *וּבְיָמֶיךָ*, which here means *in*; see 1 Sam. vii. 16;—ix. 15; Ps. xvi. 11;—cxl. 13; Ezek. xlvii. 23. And the feminine termination *יָהּ*, which agreeably to the Hebrew reads, *in her*; but according to the idiom of our language, *in it*, or *within*. The following word *מִלִּיִּיתִי*, *milayith*, is not noticed in the common version, which is absolutely necessary to obtain the meaning of the sacred writer; indeed it cannot be known without it; and it is surprising how translators have dared to reject it. No other reason can possibly be assigned, than that they have not understood, that God always communicated with his people from the mercy-seat after the fall. They have supposed that the first institution of the Cherubim was in the time of Moses, when all the particulars were given to him in the mount. But I shall frequently have occasion to observe, that the Hebrews had the tabernacle when in Egypt, which they brought with them into the wilderness, before that which was commanded to be erected by Moses. And thus this important knowledge has been covered in oblivion; as well as the priesthood before the flood, and from the flood to the establishment of the Levitical priesthood at the time of Moses. As to that before the Levitical, it has not even been supposed that there was a *regular* priesthood; see on ch. xxxvii. 3. This word is truly translated by *temple*; a place for divine worship. See 2 Kings xi. 10, 13, *in the temple*; Isa. lvi. 7; 1 Chron. vi. 10;—xxiii. 10;—xxxv. 20. See also Prov. xvii. 1, where the same word is translated, *than a house*.

And with the *n men* prefixed, viz. *with*, it means the *interior*

apartment, which was the place of the mercy-seat, and the ark of the covenant, where Noah, as the priest of God, received the divine communication from between the Cherubim.

וּבְיָמֶיךָ *Vu michants* is translated *and without*; but the *n men*, prefixed, viz. *with*, is also omitted in the common version in this word, which reads—*also with an outer room*. And so the translators not supposing that God was worshipped while Noah was in the ark, have applied this word to mean the covering of the ark *without* with pitch. But this word is connected in the same branch of the proposition with *מִלִּיִּיתִי*, and means an outer apartment, where the sacrifices were offered on the altar, according to the form of the *holy place*, which was the outer division where was the altar; and of the Holy of Holies, in the tabernacle in the wilderness, and in the temple, which was the same as the interior apartment in the ark.

Thus we find that during the time of Noah's being in the ark, which was above a year, divine worship was celebrated, and sacrifices were offered, agreeably to the order of that dispensation, when God communed with him from the mercy-seat.

Hence it appears, as we have seen in the case of Cain, that there could be no church, no communication from God, but where there was sacrificial worship agreeably to his command. And as it must be allowed that Noah while he was in the ark received the divine communication, it will be obvious that there never was a time when the church of God ceased to be on earth; but which must necessarily have been so, had not sacrifices been offered during the time that Noah was in the ark. From the fall, when the Redeemer was promised, through all the patriarchal churches to Noah, from Noah to Moses, and from Moses to the establishment of the Christian dispensation, God has always preserved a people who have constituted his church.

The last word *וּבְיָמֶיךָ*, *kopher*, i. e. *atonement, ransom, or satisfaction*, finishes the verse, with the preposition *בְּ*, *beth*, prefixed; which means *for*. The whole clause reads literally thus, *For thou shalt expiate in the inner room of the house, but the outer is for atonement*.

16. *A window shalt thou make to the ark*. It appears in the translation that a window was to be made in the ark, which was to be finished in a cubit above, by which it is thought that it was to be the size of a cubit. This is a great error, for the word *וְחַלּוֹן*, *tochar*, rendered *a window*, is a noun masculine, and is not connected with *וְחַלּוֹן*, *taklenah*, *finish*, a verb feminine; beside, the word *וְחַלּוֹן*, *tochar*, does not mean *a window*, but *a light* which Noah was to make in the ark; and here ends the division in the first proposition, as is signified by the proper accent in the original. The translators therefore have erred in making the first proposition end at *וְחַלּוֹן*, *milmanlah*, rendered *from above*; but it ends at *וְחַלּוֹן*, *tashim*, which they have rendered

I have seen thee just before my face, in this generation.

2 Of every clean beast, thou shalt take to thee sevens, every one with his female: and of the beasts which are not clean, of the same, two, each with his female.

3 Also of the bird of the heaven sevens, male and female: for living seed, upon the face of all the earth.

4 For in seven days more, I will cause rain upon the earth, forty days, and forty nights: yea I will destroy all that subsisteth which I have made, from off the face of the ground.

5 So Noah prepared, according to all that JEHOVAH had commanded him.

6 Now Noah was six hundred years old, when the deluge of waters was upon the earth.

7 Then Noah came, with his sons and his wife, also the wives of his sons with him, into the ark; from the face of the waters of the deluge.

8 Of clean beasts, also of beasts not clean: and from the bird; even all which moveth over the ground.

9 Two and two they came to Noah into the ark, male and female; as God had commanded Noah.

10 Now it was after seven days, when the waters of the deluge, were upon the earth.

11 In the six hundredth year of the life of Noah, in the second month; on the seventeenth

day of the month: on this day, all the fountains of the great deep were broken; and the cataracts of the heaven, were opened.

12 So the rain was upon the earth; forty days, and forty nights.

13 On this same day came Noah, also Shem, with Ham, and Japheth, sons of Noah; and the wife of Noah, with the three wives of his sons with them, into the ark.

14 They, with every beast after his kind, with all the cattle after their kind; even every reptile creeping upon the earth after his kind: and every bird according to his kind; every bird of every wing.

15 So they came to Noah, into the ark: two and two of all flesh, wherein was the breath of life;

16 There they came, male and female, of all flesh they came; as God had commanded him: thus JEHOVAH delivered him.

17 Now the deluge was forty days, upon the earth: so the waters increased, and carried the ark, that she was raised above the earth.

18 Thus the waters prevailed, and increased greatly, upon the earth: and the ark went upon the face of the water.

19 Yea the waters were exceedingly great upon the earth: and covered all the highest mountains; even under the whole heaven.

20 Fifteen cubits the waters prevailed even above: thus they covered the mountains.

thereof. The *tebath*, ark, and the verb *takhmah*, to finish, being both feminine, and connected in the same proposition with *amah*, cubit; shew, that the cubit was not applied to the window, but to the ark: that it was to be finished to a cubit breadth *milmagulah* even on the summit, i. e. the top of the roof.

This chapter contains a particular account of the entrance of Noah and his family into the ark, with the creatures clean and unclean; the clean by sevens, and the unclean by two and two, male and female. In the preceding chapter we have found that one reason why the greater number of clean beasts was taken into the ark, was, that the sacrificial worship might be observed, during the time that the waters were upon the earth; and this account of the sacrifices offered in the ark, was transmitted to posterity, to shew, that God has always preserved his visible church. Had not this been the case, (as observed above) had the sacrifices and the stonement ceased, but for one year, there then would have been a time when there was no church on earth.

11. From this verse we learn that the antediluvians understood the exact method of ascertaining the time; the year, month; and the day of the month are noted by the sacred writer; which had been registered by the venerable patriarch, and handed down in their sacred records, to the time of Abraham and Moses.

16. And the Lord shut him in. When the INEFFABLE DEITY

is mentioned, such undignified and familiar language, does not become the creature; it is bringing the infinite Jehovah to a level with man. It must appear obvious that there was no necessity for such a translation; as the man under whose direction the ark was made, was capable of shutting the door of the ark, though he was not able to deliver himself without the divine aid.

The word *va yigor*, rendered, *he shut*, means in its root, *to deliver*; thus a person is said to be delivered from an enemy by being shut up in a house, or a city, where the enemy cannot pursue him. In this sense the word occurs throughout the scripture; Deut. xxiii. 15, *thou shalt deliver*; Josh. xx. 5, *they will deliver*; 1 Sam. xvii. 4;—xxiv. 18;—xxvi. 8; 2 Sam. xviii. 28; Job xvi. 11; Amos i. 9, &c. And accordingly, a word should have been chosen in other languages, consistent with its meaning and application, and with the idiom of the verb. The clause reads, *Thus Jehovah delivered him*.

19, 20. And the mountains were covered. In the common version, there is a repetition in these verses. We are told in the 19th verse, *And all the high hills that were under the whole heaven were covered*; the same is repeated in the 20th verse; *And the mountains were covered*. The word *ha haarin*, occurs in both these verses; it is translated by *hills*, in the 19th verse, and by *mountains*, in the 20th. But it must be obvious, as it is the self-same word, and the orthography and construction the same, that the rendering must be the same in both verses.

21 And all flesh expired, that moved upon the earth, of bird, and cattle, and beast; with every reptile, creeping upon the earth: also every man.

22 All in whose nostrils *was* the breath of the spirit of life, for all on the dry land died.

23 Even all manner of substance he destroyed, which *was* upon the face of the ground, from man to cattle, and reptile, even to the bird of the heaven; yea they were destroyed, from the earth: and Noah only remained, and those with him, in the ark.

24 Thus the waters prevailed upon the earth; an hundred and fifty days.

CHAP. VIII.

NOW God remembered Noah, and all the living, even all the cattle, that *were* with him, in the ark: then God passed a wind over the earth; and the waters subsided.

2 For the springs of the deep, and the cata-racts of the heaven were shut: also the rain was restrained from the heaven.

3 Then the waters returned, from off the earth, continually so returning: thus the waters failed; after the end of a hundred and fifty days.

4 And the ark rested in the seventh month; on the seventeenth day of the month; upon the mountain of Ararat.

5 Thus the waters continually decreased, till the tenth month: in the tenth, on the first of the month, the tops of the mountains were seen.

6 Now it was at the end of forty days, then Noah, opened, the window of the ark, which he had made.

7 And he sent a raven, which went forth,

viz. mountains. The verb *were* is put into the text, for which there is no authority in the Hebrew.

The common reading is, no doubt, very bad: the Hebrew is correct; for after the statement in the 19th verse, that the high hills, or mountains, were covered, the sacred writer proceeds to describe the particulars, by saying, *fifteen cubits the waters prevailed even above.* He does not then say as in the common version a second time, *and the mountains were covered;* but, *thus they covered the mountains.* And the reason why he was so particular in mentioning the highest mountains, appears to be that as their heathen temples, which were first devoted to the true worship of God, were at this period devoted only to idolatrous worship; so it was to convince posterity, that whoever trust in an arm of flesh, to save themselves by their *own* providence, i. e. their own righteousness, independent of the foundation that is laid by the Messiah, once offered up for all men, will, when weighed in the balance, be found wanting.

These verses deserve particular attention, as tending to shew

going and returning; till the waters were dried, from off the earth.

8 Also he sent the dove from him, to see if the waters abated, from off the face of the ground;

9 But the dove found no rest for the sole of her foot, so she returned to him into the ark; because of the water on the face of all the earth: then he put forth his hand, and took her; and he brought her to him, into the ark.

10 Moreover he waited yet, another seven days; and he again sent the dove from the ark.

11 Then the dove came to him, at the time of evening; and lo, a leaf of olive, torn off *was* in her mouth; then Noah knew, that the waters abated from off the earth.

12 Yet he waited again, another seven days; then he sent the dove; but she returned not to him again.

13 Now it was in the six hundredth and first year, in the beginning, the first of the month; the waters were dried from off the earth: so Noah removed the covering from the ark; then he looked, and behold, the face of the ground was dry.

14 Now in the second month, on the seven and twentieth day of the month; the earth was dry.

15 ¶ Then God spake, to Noah, saying,

16 Go out of the ark: thou, and thy wife, also thy sons, and the wives of thy sons with thee.

17 All that liveth which is with thee of all flesh, of bird and of cattle, also every reptile that creepeth upon the earth, shall go out with thee: for they shall produce on the earth; and be fruitful and multiply upon the earth.

18 Then Noah went forth; also his sons,

how the patriarchal religion was handed down to posterity. We have seen ch. vi. 20, that the antediluvian sacrificial service, which was given at the fall, was transmitted through the line of Seth to Noah, and which was commanded to be kept up in the ark during the deluge; for the sanctuary with the holy place *within*, and an outer place for the *atonement*, is a declaration of this fact. Now in this chapter we are informed of Noah's coming from the ark, and of his continuing sacrificial worship; *he built an altar and offered sacrifice.* This is not a casual notice of a particular incident; it is introduced for the purpose of stating the continuance of sacrificial worship; for it is added, *and Jehovah accepted the incense of rest:* not as in the authorized version, *smelled a sweet savour of rest.* The sense is, that God manifested his approbation of the way in which Noah had again established the *ancient order of the sanctuary.* the *מזבח הקֹּחַפָּתָה*, the expiatory and the *מזבח הכֹּפָּר*, for atonement. For before the *mercy-seat* within the veil, was properly the place of rest, because here it was that God accepted the sacrifices and

with his wife and the wives of his sons with him;

19 Every beast, every reptile, and every bird; all creeping upon the earth: according to their kinds, they went out of the ark.

20 Then Noah built an altar, before JEHOVAH; and he took of every clean beast, also of every clean bird; and he offered offerings on the altar.

21 And JEHOVAH accepted the incense of rest; moreover JEHOVAH said in his heart, I will neither consume, nor curse again the ground, for the transgression of man; though the imagination of the heart of man, be evil from his youth: no, I will neither consume, nor smite again all living, as I have done.

22 To all the days of the earth: seed-time and harvest, with cold and heat, also summer and winter, for day and night shall not cease.

CHAP. IX.

NOW God blessed Noah, and his sons; and he said to them, Be ye fruitful, and multiply, yea fill ye the earth:

2 For the fear of you, even your terror shall be upon every beast of the earth, and upon every bird of the heaven; on all that moveth on the ground, yea on all the fish of the sea, into your hand they are delivered.

3 All that moveth with life, shall be to you for food: like to the green herb, I have given to you even all.

gave rest to those who were obedient to his commands. And as the proper place for the regular sacrifices was in the outer apartment, or *before the veil*; so this is signified by what is said ch. viii. 20, when he built an altar, and offered the burnt-offerings. Thus when the altar was built, by which is also understood a place of worship, with the *קדש* *mishkan*, *Holy of Holies*; here it was where he offered the sacrifices, even of every clean beast, and of every clean bird.

21. And the Lord smelled. The word *ריח* *vayarach*, rendered *and he smelled*, means *to accept*; and *ריח חן* *reecha hanichocho*, which is translated, *a sweet savour*, means *incense of rest*. Signifying that God had accepted this sacrifice, by the application of which to the life of, and faith in the Messiah, man was to find true rest.

I will not curse the ground any more, for man's sake. *בגביר* *Bagnabor*, is translated, *for man's sake*. This word signifies in its radix to transgress. Numb. xxii. 16; Josh. vii. 5; 2 Chron. xxiv. 20; Isa. xxiv. 5; the passage then reads, *because of the transgression of man*; which is in conformity with the latter part of the verse.

For the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth. This cannot be the true version; for as God was communicating with Noah, it would have been charging him with being a wicked man. *כי* *Chi*, is rendered by *for*, but its true rendering

4 But flesh with his soul, his blood, ye shall not eat.

5 Now surely your blood, of your lives, I will require; at the hand of all living, I will require it: even at the hand of the man, at the hand of each his brother; I will require the soul of the man.

6 Shedding the blood of the man; before man his blood shall be shed: for in the image of God, he made the man.

7 And you, be ye fruitful and multiply: bring ye forth on the earth, even abundantly therein.

8 ¶ Again, God spake to Noah, and to his sons with him, saying,

9 Now I, behold I establish my covenant with you; and after you, with your posterity:

10 Also for every living creature, that is with you; for bird, for cattle, and for every beast of the earth, with you: for all going out of the ark, concerning every beast of the earth.

11 Thus I establish my covenant with you; for not any flesh shall be cut off again, by the waters of the deluge: there shall not be again a deluge, to destroy the earth.

12 Then God said, This is a token of the covenant which I give, between me and you; even between every living soul, that is with you: for generations, everlasting.

13 I have set my bow in the cloud, which shall be for a witness of covenant, between me, and the earth:

here is by *though*, as in Ruth ii. 13; Ezek. xiv. 10; Zech. xii. 8; viz. *though the imagination of his heart be evil*.

NOTES ON CHAPTER IX.

2. The fear of you and the dread of you. There is no distinction made in the common version between the two verbs *וירא* *vayara*, the fear of you; and *וירא* *vayara*, the dread of you. Neither ought the *ו* *vav* to be rendered as a conjunction copulative.

5. At the hand of every beast. This is not applicable to a beast, consequently it is not intelligible. The word *כח* *chayah*, is rendered by *beast*; it comes from *חיה* *chayah*, *life*; the clause reads thus—at the hand of all living. The following clause explains it, at the hand of man.

12. And every living creature. The same error is made here as in the 5th verse. The word *כח* *chayah*, is applied to the living creature, the beast: the word connected with it is *נפש* *nephesh*, the soul: which then is applied to the soul of man, viz. and between every living soul.

13. I do set my bow. From this translation it appears, that the rainbow had never been set; consequently had never been seen from the time of Adam to Noah; a supposition which cannot be admitted; for it would necessarily lead us to this conclusion: that there had been neither rain nor rainbow: in the

14 Now it shall be, as I bring a cloud over the earth, and the bow shall be seen in the cloud;

15 So I will remember my covenant, which is between me, and you; also every creature of life, among all flesh: that there shall not be again the waters of a deluge, to destroy all flesh.

16 When the bow shall be in the cloud; then I will behold it, to record the everlasting covenant, between God; and every creature of life, among all flesh that is upon the earth.

17 Thus God said, to Noah: This is a token

atmosphere, to cause the rainbow, during that period. And though it is said, ch. ii. 5, that God had not caused it to rain upon the earth; it should be remembered, that this was a state of things before the creation of man, at which period it appears, it was not necessary, nor till man began to till the ground.

The word *naakhti*, is translated, *I do set*; but it must appear that there was no necessity for the word *do*, accordingly there is no word in the original to authorize this translation. It is in the preter tense, viz. *I have set*, meaning, that as certainly, as God had set the bow in the cloud; and as certainly as it appeared when he brought a cloud over the earth: so certainly he would remember his covenant with man. It must also appear obvious, that Noah must have seen the bow, and have known the cause of it; for certainly God would not have referred him to this natural phenomenon to have confirmed him in his dependence on his faithfulness, had he not understood the certainty of its being seen, in the state of the atmosphere here described.

14. The *vau*, which introduces this verse, is not a conjunction copulative; it is properly to be rendered by *for*; as it is so translated in other parts of scripture, with the same construction.

16. *That I may remember*. This is neither consistent with the perfection of God, nor with the original; as it supposes, that he who knows all things, required something to put him in mind of his promise. The *vau*, prefixed to *naakhti*, remember, is adverbial, and should be rendered by *when*.

17. *This is the token of the covenant*. It has hitherto been understood, that the rainbow was the token of the everlasting covenant between God and man. But a token, sign, or symbol, comprehends in its figure, a representation of something like itself. There is however, no conformity, or agreement between the everlasting covenant established between God and man, and the rainbow.

We have seen that the rainbow was referred to, in order to convince the postdiluvians of the certainty of the faithfulness of God. For as Noah knew that the rainbow was a natural phenomenon, which always to a certainty appeared when the sun was not more than an eighth part of the circle, or forty-five degrees above the horizon; so he was told in reference to this sacrifice he was offering, ver. 20th of the preceding chapter; that as certainly as the bow always appeared, so certainly God would fulfil his ancient promise, and establish his covenant, by sending the Messiah; who by this token, sign, or symbolical sacrifice, was represented as the end of all sacrifice. Thus respecting these sacrifices, it is said, *This is the token of the covenant, an evidence, token, sign, or symbol* of the thing mentioned to come, and not the covenant itself.

From which it is plain that the covenant which God had

of the covenant, which I have established, between me, and all flesh, that is upon the earth.

18 Now the sons of Noah who went forth from the ark, were Shem, and Ham, and Japheth; and Ham was the father of Canaan.

19 These three sons of Noah; even from these all the earth was overspread.

20 Now the man Noah cultivated the ground; also he planted a vineyard.

21 Then he drank of the wine, and he was satisfied: for he himself opened the inmost part of the tabernacle,

established by his promise in Eden, the *naakhti*, i.e. purifying sacrifice; referred to the life of the Redeemer, which life was to be manifested in flesh. The creatures offered were signs, tokens; leading the mind of the sincere offerer by faith to receive the life of the Redeemer, and to manifest that life in all his words and actions. Thus it signified to them, an inward life, operating by outward acts of obedience to the divine precepts—not by an empty belief—not by faith alone without works—but agreeably to what is said, 1 Sam. xv. 22, *Hath the Lord as great delight in burnt-offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the Lord? behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken, than the fat of rams*. And the Apostle James, ii. 26, *For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also*.

21. *And he drank of the wine and was drunken*. Among the great number of errors which are to be found in the common version, this, where the venerable patriarch is charged with drunkenness, is so obvious a departure from the spirit and letter of the original, that it is truly astonishing it should have been permitted to disgrace the pages of the Bible in all the translations: and that no one has attempted to wipe away the foul blot from the character of the man of God. I shall therefore endeavour to give the meaning of the sacred writer, by adhering to the literal sense of those words in the original, which have been mistaken by translators.

The investigation of this subject, will not only meet the objections of the deist, but will also ascertain the origin of idolatry after the deluge; the establishment of the true worship of God, and the formation of governments and nations.

The word *va yishkaar*, which is in the common version rendered, *and he was drunken*, can here have no such meaning; it is also applied as a figure to the mind, elevated, or carried beyond its usual state: to be drunk with blood, means to shed much blood: a nation is said to be drunken, when it is in a low state, unable to guide itself. In every part of scripture where it occurs, and is applied to intoxication with strong drink, it is always accompanied with its own application, by which it cannot be misunderstood. See 1 Kings xvi. 9, *he was drinking himself drunk*;—xx. 16; Jer. xliii. 9, *I am like a drunken man, overcome with wine*; 1 Sam. xxv. 36; 2 Sam. xi. 13; 1 Kings xx. 16; Job xii. 25; Psa. lxx. 12;—cvii. 27; Isa. v. 11, 22; Jer. xxiii. 9; Joel i. 5; Lev. x. 9; Numb. vi. 3;—xxviii. 7. But the word in this verse has no reference to any other word by which it can be understood that Noah was in a state of drunkenness with strong drink. The proper words which are used by the sacred writers to mean drunkenness with strong drink, are; *naamah*, Deut. xxix. 19, *drunkenness to thirst*;—xxi. 20, *a glutton, sober, and a drunkard*.

22 Where Ham the father of Canaan, exposed, the symbols of his father; which he declared to his two brethren, without.

Prov. xlii. 21, *the drunkard and the glutton*; Nah. i. 10, *drunken as drunkards*; and Eccles. x. 17, *eat in due season, for strength, and not בשרי beshari, for drunkenness*.

But when the word שָׁכָר *shakar*, is applied figuratively to signify a state of mind overwhelmed in trouble, or carried beyond the bounds of reason, by any passion; it means to be *satiated, filled, satisfied*. See the following passages where the word ought to be so translated: Isa. lxiii. 6, *Drunk in my fury*; this cannot mean drunkenness with strong drink: but as strong drink disorders the brain, so it signifies a disordered state of the mind by trouble: *satiated with my fury*.

Deut. xxxii. 42, *I will make mine arrows drunk with blood*. This is a striking figure, for as arrows are winged with destruction, so it shews the certainty of the execution of the judgments of God; which are compared to arrows. Now as the word *drunk*, cannot be applied to the arrows, it is obvious that it refers to the execution of the judgments. And therefore it literally reads, *I will satisfy mine arrows with blood*.

Ezek. xxxix. 19, *And drink blood till ye be drunken*. This also is evidently figurative. The prophet was here commanded to make known the redemption of Israel, which is described by the figure of a great battle, where by the mighty power of God, the Israelites were victorious. So that as they were not to be assembled to eat flesh and drink blood, it means a state fully *satisfied with shedding blood*; and should be rendered, *and drink (or shed) blood, till ye be satisfied*.

Jer. li. 7, *That made all the earth drunken*. In this chapter, the prophet spake of the destruction of Babylon, saying, ver. 6, *This is the time of the Lord's vengeance*. But in the common version we read, *Babylon has been a golden cup in the Lord's hand, that made all the earth drunken*. From which it appears in the common version, that Babylon was only made an instrument in the hand of God to lead the people to idolatry. There is not any authority for the words, *hath been*, and the true rendering will shew that this was not so.

מְשַׁכֶּרֶת *Meshakereth*, which is rendered *that made drunken*, is the participle active feminine in Pihel, viz. *satisfying diligently*. This passage then shews, that as *this was the time of the vengeance of Jehovah*, ver. 6, he had taken the golden cup from Babel, and was *satisfying the nations* concerning the abominations of her idolatries. The verse reads, *The golden cup of Babel is in the hand of Jehovah; satisfying diligently all the earth*. From which it will appear that the word שָׁכָר *shakar*, was not applied by the sacred writer to Noah, to signify a state of drunkenness with strong drink.

Isaiah xlix. 9, *They are drunken, but not with wine*. Here we are told that they were not drunken with wine; and a reference to the 13th verse will shew, that this word means to be *satisfied*; for the prophet was commanded to inform them that they rested *satisfied* with their ceremonial worship only. *Forasmuch as this people draw near to me with their mouth, and with their lips do honour me, but have removed their heart far from me*. This clause therefore should be rendered, *they are satisfied, but not with wine*. This passage also shews that they were completely absorbed in sensuality; they were *satisfied* with external worship, the mere form without having any desire for the religion of the heart; but, the prophet tells them, they were not satisfied with the inordinate use of wine.

Isa. xlix. 26, *They shall be drunken with their own blood*. This passage in the common version differs from the Hebrew.

23 But Shem with Japheth had taken the vestment, which both of them set up for a portion; thus they afterwards went, and concealed

It is said they were to be *drunken with their own blood as with sweet wine*. We certainly know that it is not in the nature of blood to make people drunken as with wine; and if it were said that the first part of this proposition is figurative, it cannot be allowed while the latter part is literal. The word שֶׁכָּר *ve kegnasis*, is rendered as *with sweet wine*. This word cannot be rendered *sweet wine*, or *new wine*; and where it is so translated, which is but in three other places in the Bible, it is decidedly wrong. The radical meaning of this word is to *tread, to tread on*; Mal. iv. 3, *And ye shall tread down the wicked*. It is an allusion to the distress which should come upon the enemies of the Messiah, the Redeemer, mentioned in this verse; who should be trodden as the treading tread out the juice of the grape. Preserving the Hebrew syntax, it reads with propriety and far greater energy, thus, *I will feed thy oppressors with their flesh, ye, the treader of blood shall be satisfied*. Thus we find that שָׁכָר *shakar*, is here truly translated by *satisfied*.

And he was *uncovered within his tent*. Many have been the conjectures of commentators in all ages of the Christian era, concerning this act of Noah. Most writers have supposed that he had retired into the holy place, before the Cherubim, for the purpose of receiving the divine vision; that in order to accomplish this, he drank the dedicated wine, and that by this vision he was to be instructed concerning the division of the earth among his descendants. Others have concluded that the uncovering here mentioned had relation to his taking off his garments, and putting on the dedicated garments of the priesthood. But with regard to the first, it cannot be allowed, that in order to receive a divine communication, it was necessary for him to make himself drunken, or that God would communicate his will to a drunken man; neither can we suppose, that Noah would depend on any thing as being sacred, that occurred in a dream, while he was in a state of intoxication.

To the second, as far as it goes, there can be no objection; but this will not correspond with the state in which he is described in the common version; for these garments would have covered his nakedness. Others have supposed that when Noah began to be a husbandman, and planted a vineyard, he was ignorant of the intoxicating nature of the juice of the grape when fermented into wine, and thus that he was overtaken with drunkenness. But neither can this state of ignorance in Noah be allowed, for it is expressly said that he planted a *vineyard*, i. e. a *garden of vines*; from which we learn that the antediluvians had gardens of vines, and consequently knew the quality and effect of the juice of the grape, which was used as a sacramental offering in all the churches from the fall. Leaving therefore all conjectures, we must draw our information concerning this and other abstruse passages from the literal meaning of the words, where such words occur in other parts of scripture, where they can have no other meaning, nor application, than they have in such places; which must also be in conformity with the whole narrative concerning this transaction of the venerable postdiluvian father of the human race.

The word נִפְחָל *va yithgal*, has been improperly translated as the third person singular in *niphal*, or the passive conjugation of *hal*; he was *uncovered*. But the verb being in the Hithpael conjugation, which means that the person himself does the thing mentioned, it should have been rendered accordingly, as verbs in the same conjugation are necessarily translated in other scriptures.

This word means to open בָּרַח *va yigal*, and he *openeth*, Job xxxvi. 10; — xxxiii. 16; to shew, 1 Sam. xxi. 17; to

the symbols of their father: with their faces backward; but the symbols of their father, they saw not.

24 When Noah ended, his wine, for he knew that his younger son had offered, for himself;

reveal, 1 Sam. iii. 21; *to publish*, Esth. iii. 14. That is, *Noah himself*, as high-priest, opened the inmost part of the tabernacle, or Holy of Holies, where God communicated his will, which gives an understanding of this text consistently with every other similar part of scripture.

The whole context is in the original Hebrew so diametrically opposed to the sense conveyed in the common version, that every word deserves particular attention. Noah was perfectly satisfied, not only with the meat-offerings, and the drink-offerings, but with the plenitude of the dispensation which God had given for the redemption of man. As high priest he durst not drink wine before he went into the holy place, Lev. x. 9. In the worship, the drink-offering was offered by being first poured out on the altar before God; wine (as observed) having been used as a type in the church from the fall. It was continued in the Jewish church to the time of Christ, and it is retained in Christian churches to this day.

In the 9th verse we are told that God established *berithi*, the covenant of purification with Noah, as the word signifies; when he built an altar, and dedicated it to God, with the ceremonies commanded to be observed under that dispensation. And as he had been a preacher of righteousness to the antediluvians, so he was called to promulgate those laws and ordinances, which had been observed by the true worshippers from the beginning. And thus we learn, that among that primæval people, it was the custom of the priest only to enter into the Holy of Holies during divine service.

That there was an ark or tabernacle in which the divine symbols were placed, before that spoken of by Moses, and which was as ancient as the fall, appears from scripture: Gen. iii. 24, *And he placed at the east of the garden of Eden, Cherubims, and a flaming sword*. The word *yashcheen*, signifies, that there was a tabernacle from the fall, and which certainly continued in the believing line of Seth; was preserved by Noah, and handed down in the line of Eber, till the children of Israel went into Egypt; and was finally brought by them from thence. For it is plain from Exod. xxx. 9, that the Israelites had a sacred tabernacle before that which was commanded to be erected by Moses, which undoubtedly was brought out of Egypt. But it may be asked, If there were a tabernacle before the time of Moses brought out of Egypt, where was the necessity for another? I answer, that as the dispensation given to Moses was a new order of things, comprehending forms and ceremonies of a different kind, it is consistent with scripture to conclude, that there was a necessity for another tabernacle, the form and uses of which were to correspond with the states of that people. Now whether the manner of the divine communication by this first tabernacle was similar to that of the second, is not easy perhaps to determine; but it is consistent with reason to conclude, that as the first dispensation in its origin, was in point of excellency far superior to the second, so the medium of communication might be of a far more superior and heavenly nature. Certain it is, that at the time of the exodus, the idolaters so far copied the true religion by having such kind of tabernacles for their idols.

22. *And Ham the father of Canaan saw*. The word *way* is *gare*, rendered *saw*, has various applications, it means to

25 Then he said, Cursed is Canaan: a servant of servants, he shall be, to his brethren.

26 But he said, Blessed of JEHOVAH GOD is Shem; for Canaan shall be, a servant to them.

27 God will persuade by Japheth, for he shall

disdain, to appear; *expose*, look, to present himself, to intrude, where it was forbidden, to provide. Thus it appears that Ham had intruded himself, or presented himself, in the holy place, before the Cherubim, which he had exposed, with a design to introduce the idolatrous antediluvian worship. Now as Ham was professedly an idolater, he informed his two brethren *bechams*, in the outer part, who officiated at the altar. Hence, as it appears, that Ham, who was anxious to establish the idolatry of the old world, endeavoured to draw his two brethren into his views, by exposing the divine symbols of his father: I have accordingly rendered the above word in conformity with its radical meaning, by, *exposed*; which meaning is confirmed by the obvious sense of the word, and the narrative: as it must be allowed that Ham, in order to bring into contempt the true worship of God, had made an exposure of those things, which agreeably to the divine command, were only approachable by the high priest; and were always held as most sacred from the beginning to the end of the patriarchal churches.

The nakedness of his father. The word *gnervath*, is here rendered *nakedness*. It will be recollected, when man had departed from that state of innocence in which God had created him, that the divine will was made known immediately from the Cherubim, where the ark with the testimony, and the mercy-seat were placed, in the inner apartment of the tabernacle, covered from the vulgar eye; as emblematically representative of the attributes of Jehovah, who dwelleth between the Cherubim.

The misapplication of one word, often tends to lead away from the sense of the passage. Having taken *gnervath*, for *drunkenness*, the translators mistook the nature of the place mentioned in the context, and have made Noah drink wine within a tent, or booth. Noah, a master architect, who built a house for himself, and for every living creature of all flesh, is thus made to dwell in a tent! as though he had not been able to provide himself with a more commodious habitation. The idea thus conveyed, leads to misconception, as if Noah had only recently come out of the ark. But the sacred historian had before mentioned that fact, and he was now detailing others connected with the history, and necessary to be known, but not necessarily referred to in all their circumstances, at so early a period. In truth it related to a much later period, when his posterity had well peopled the earth. For after the words in the 17th verse, where it is declared that God established the covenant with Noah, there appears to have been a vast lapse of time between this establishment of the covenant, and the end of the 19th verse, where it is said, *the world was overspread by the sons of Noah*. From which we may safely draw this conclusion; that at this period when Ham attempted to overthrow the established worship, the descendants of Noah were very numerous.

The word *gnervath*, is not a noun singular, as in the common version; like similar words in all languages, it means, to discover, make known, reveal, expose, Isa. iii. 17; Lev. xx. 18; Hab. iii. 9, *thy bow was made quite naked*, (Hebrew, *exposed*) Isa. xx. 4, to uncover, and so to expose, Isa. xii. 6; Zeph. ii. 14. It is also used to mean the *unclean thing*, Deut. xxii. 14; also *shame*, Isa. xx. 4; shame being the effect of the exposure of improper conduct. I have therefore translated this word by

dwell in the tabernacles of Shem: thus Canaan shall be a servant to them.

symbols, agreeably to the meaning comprehended in its radix; connecting the idiom with the obvious sense of the whole narrative: the exposure of the sacred symbols, the Cherubim, the ark, and the mercy-seat, being the crime that Ham committed, in order to introduce the pretended mysteries of the old idolatry. In truth, the whole I say related to a much later period, when his posterity had well peopled the earth.

The following question, which is a very natural one, has often been asked by objectors; viz. Where was the necessity for withholding the sight of the symbols from the people in public worship? I answer, the withholding of the divine symbols from the vulgar eye, was well understood by the people; they well knew the meaning of the word *יהוה* Jehovah; that as it was descriptive of the whole complex of the attributes of God; so by the different symbols in the Holy of Holies, they understood that his particular attributes were signified; with all their explanations of the divine goodness, relative to the manifestation of Messiah, for the redemption of man. They were also informed, by their being concealed from the vulgar eye, that finite beings could not scrutinize into the infinite nature of God,—that the creature could not comprehend the Creator, because he only is INFINITE, INCOMPREHENSIBLE, and UNCREATE!

אהלֹהִים *Aheloh*, is rendered by his tent. But there is no pronoun possessive, so that the word cannot be translated *his tent*; it is literally the tabernacle, the place of divine worship. And it is very remarkable, that not merely the tabernacle is mentioned, but *בֵּית־הַבְּחִיִּים* *bethok*, the inner apartment, or division thereof. What have we here then but the most holy place? for there was neither necessity nor propriety in saying the *midst*, or *innermost* apartment, had this word been applied by the sacred writer to mean the tent, or temporary habitation, in which Noah resided, as is the general, but obviously erroneous opinion, to the present day. The historian is brief; but we should recollect for whom he was commanded to write—for a people who had among them such a tabernacle, and who therefore could not possibly misunderstand to what he was alluding; nor would they be at a loss to know what was meant by *מִן־הַקִּדְשִׁים* *guervath*, the sacred symbols; by which God revealed his will to man, agreeably to the order under that figurative, or representative dispensation.

23. And laid it upon both their shoulders. *וַיָּשִׂם* *va yasimou*, has various applications, all partaking of the nature of the root: as, *make, set, put, consider, reward, appoint*, &c. Judg. viii. 33; —xi. 11; Ezek. xx. 28, and *made*; Exod. ix. 5; 2 Kings xi. 18; —xviii. 14; 2 Chron. xiii. 18, *to appoint*; Isa. xlv. 7; Prov. viii. 29; 1 Sam. viii. 12, *disposed*; Job xxxvii. 15, *to preserve*; Gen. xxv. 7, *to set up*; Deut. xiv. 24; Hab. ii. 9; Job v. 11. *שֵׁמֶרֶץ* *Shechem* is rendered, *their shoulders*; but the word is not plural, neither is there a plural pronoun connected with it, as in the common version. This word gives the idea of that which is elevated, or that which elevates, another as to his circumstances, and thus raises such above mediocrity—a portion. The same word is applied by the patriarch to Joseph, which elevated him above his brethren. Gen. xlviii. 22, *I have given to thee ONE PORTION above thy brethren*. It is also used to mean the shoulder—a rising ground, Psa. xxi. 12. But the primary meaning is to be elevated above others; which was the case with Shem and Japheth, who succeeded to the priesthood.

Agreeably to the meaning of this word, *וַיָּשִׂם* *Yaasimou*, i. e. *set up*, in connexion with the obvious sense of the narrative

28 Now Noah lived after the deluge, three hundred and fifty years.

respecting the crime of Ham, we learn, that he had attempted to substitute the old idolatry, and to effect this, had taken away the covering vail, which was suspended before the sacred symbols, but which was restored by Shem and Japheth; and with it, the prompt establishment of the true worship.

They saw not. No one but the appointed priest was permitted to enter into the Holy of Holies, before the divine symbols: and the reason appears obvious. In the representative churches, every rite had relation to the coming of the Messiah; and therefore by the entrance of the priest into the Holy of Holies with the blood of the covenant, also at other times, with the incense; they understood that Messiah only could redeem them; who agreeably to the declaration of the apostle, the Lion of the tribe of Judah, alone had power to open the book, and to make a way into the Holy of Holies for the redemption of his people.

24. Noah awoke from his wine. The word *וַיִּשְׁכַּח* *va yichet*, does not mean *awoke*, neither is it connected with any word that means sleep. This word comes from *קָטַע* *katsat*, to cut off—to end—an extreme part. Job vi. 11, *mine end*; 2 Kings xviii. 16, *cut off*; Dan. xi. 45, *his end, his border*. The patriarch was at this interval in the Holy of Holies, where he poured the wine offering before the mercy-seat; here he received the communication, and when he had ended his wine offering, he delivered the divine command respecting the posterity of Ham.

And knew what his younger son had done to him. This clause is, in the common version, applied to Noah, as though Ham had done something to him. The passage informs us, that Ham saw the nakedness of his father; but it does not say that he did any thing to him; therefore this translation is not consistent with the sense of the narrative.

Ham was the founder of the antediluvian idolatry, which comprehended the worship of the sun and the serpent. See *Hist. of all Religions*. And as he could not succeed to the priesthood in the true worship of God, because it was then conferred on the first-born, he resolved on adopting the ancient worship of idols: and thus he became the patriarch of idolatry. Therefore the word *וַיִּשְׁכַּח* *gnaasah*, rendered, *had done*; viz. *what his younger son had done*: should according to idiom be translated as it is in 1 Kings viii. 64; 2 Chron. vii. 7, *offered*.

וְלֹא *lo*, is translated to him, and thus it is applied to Noah, as though something had been done to him. This was however applied by the sacred writer to Ham, not to Noah; as having himself offered sacrifice to the idols. Then he proceeds to the denunciation against the idolatrous posterity, who had at this period become very numerous under Canaan the son of Ham, in the land of Canaan; which took its name from him: and who were thus cursed, or separated, from the true worshippers of God, by the patriarch.

25. Cursed be Canaan. This passage has always been resorted to by objectors, to prove that it is neither consistent with the principles of common justice, nor with the positive declarations of scripture, to punish the children for the crimes of the father, it being said, that the children shall not be put to death for the father, nor the father for the children, but that every one shall suffer for his own sin. But what is more surprising, we learn by the common version, that Ham, the person who is here charged with the crime, escapes without either curse or punishment.

29 So all the days that Noah lived, were nine hundred, and fifty years: when he died.

CHAP. X.

NOW these are the generations of the sons of Noah, Shem, Ham, and Japheth; and to them were sons born after the deluge.

We also learn, that Ham had even succeeded in fixing the *generath*, i.e. *unclean thing*, the idolatrous images in the tabernacle of the true worship; as he had done in the tabernacles of his son Canaan. This was the reason why the sacred writer called them, *the tabernacles of Ham*, Psa. lxxviii. 51. Thus at length, when the population had greatly increased, he introduced the symbols of the antediluvian idolatry, in place of the Cherubim, which had been established in the church from the fall. We are led to this conclusion, not only from the conduct of Shem and Japheth, who removed this abomination, but by the word *אָרָר* *Arur*, rendered, *cursed*. This word means, the *solar light*, which the idolaters worshipped; and as those who paid adoration to images instead of the living God, were cursed, or separated, so this word meant the most severe of all curses, even as the worship of the light of the sun, to which they attributed all their good instead of God, was the most heinous of all the idolatrous worship. Therefore this *curse* was applied to mean a final separation from the true worshippers.

I have shown that the attempt of Ham to overturn the true worship of God, by the establishment of the antediluvian idolatry, must have been at a very remote period after the deluge. That the patriarchal governing families, in the line of Ham, who were the heads of nations, are said to have been *thirty-two*, ch. x. 6, to 18; those of Shem, *twenty-six*, ver. 22 to 29; and those of Japheth *eleven*, ver. 2 to 4. From which it appears, that it was in the power of Ham to cause, as he did, a very serious decrease among the descendants of Seth, who had been brought up in the true worship.

Now the curse of Canaan, which has been so much complained of by those who were ignorant of its application, as being inconsistent with justice, and the declarations of scripture, was not pronounced on the son of Ham, but on the whole body of the descendants of Ham; who being joined in one bond or religious body, are here called in the preceding verse, *יָמֵי הָאָדָם* *haskataaan*, his youngest son; for it is usual in Hebrew, as in all languages, to signify a collective body by a noun singular. That is, he knew that the whole body of the Canaanites, the descendants of Ham, had established idolatry; and now that Ham was attempting to make the profession general among the true worshippers, Noah in the discharge of his duty as high priest was commanded to pronounce this curse of final separation. Therefore it was on this account that Ham was by the sacred writer called, *the father of Canaan*: but he was the father of Cush, Mizraim, and Phut; consequently had this remark not had this particular application, viz. to the body of his descendants, the Canaanites; it would have been also said, Ham, the father of Cush, Mizraim and Phut; as well as, the father of Canaan.

The word *קָנָן* *Canaan*, is a general term for the whole of the descendants of Ham, who formed different nations in the land of Canaan, which was so called from Canaan his son, on account of his being the great establisher of the antediluvian idolatry under his father. The patriarch by this name, fully expressed their character, as is the case in Hebrew names. It means, to *bow*, to *be humble*, and thus to *bow*, or *humble* them-

2 Sons of Japheth; Gomer, and Magog, and Madai, and Javan, and Tubal, and Meshech, and Tiras.

3 And the sons of Gomer; Ashkenaz, and Riphath, and Togarmah.

4 Also the sons of Javan; Elishah, and Tarshish; Kittim and Dodanim.

selves before their idols, by way of repentance. This answered two ends, as being a very easy way of obtaining forgiveness, and by this external shew of humility, they procured proselytes, and put themselves off for the only religious of that day. Like the Philistines, in after-time, a sect of the Canaanites, who frequently rolled themselves in the dust by way of self-abasement, as the original signifies; hence the expression, *roll thyself in the dust*, Micah i. 10. Even in our day the same principle manifests itself; the poor Indian measures his distance from one pagoda to another, by prostrating his body on the scorching sand—gazes on the burning sun till the optic nerve is destroyed; while others travel hundreds of miles to throw themselves as acceptable offerings, under the wheels of the mazy car of the idol Jaggernaut, in hopes of obtaining the favour of heaven.

What then is expected from a Christian government, into whose hand is given a great empire in a foreign land? What? surely that one hundred millions of unenlightened people should be brought out of the dens of idolatry, by being instructed in the true and rational worship of God. Make it but criminal in the shaster, (priest) who shall preach the necessity of such infernal sacrifices—of wives being obliged to bury or burn themselves alive on the funeral pile, at the death of their husbands—of children being thrown into the Ganges, or given to the crocodile—or of innocent victims sacrificing themselves before the idol at the temple of this modern Molochian idolatry: and every abomination of this nature, would in one day cease, and cease for ever; to the great joy of the inhabitants. I am informed by some respectable inhabitants of Calcutta, who have resided there above twenty years, that the greatest possible good has resulted from the humane act of the Marquis Wellesley: who when he was governor-general of India, in defiance of all other considerations, arising from a fear of interfering with *castes*, or sects of religion; made it death to every one who should put children to death, under any pretence whatever. The people, I am informed, rejoice that they are obliged by law to save their children, and in consequence are more happy under, and attached to the government.

That the curse which the patriarch was directed to pronounce on Canaan, was not on his son Canaan, as has been understood, but on the Canaanites, the descendants of Ham, will not admit of a doubt. Had this curse been applied to Canaan, the son of Ham, the thing mentioned in the latter part of the verse, viz. *a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren*, must necessarily have been accomplished in his person. But Canaan was not a servant; and secondly, Canaan was so far from being a servant to his brethren, that he is stated in the narrative to have been greater than any of his brethren. For it appears that he was the progenitor of eleven nations, who took from him the name of Canaanite, who formed distinct kingdoms in the land called after him, the land of Canaan; and which kingdoms were in existence in the time of Moses. But had this even been the case, that he had been a servant to his brethren, it would not have answered to the plain declaration in the text, viz. *a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren*; for Shem and Japheth

5 Among these were the countries of the Gentiles divided in their lands; every one according to his tongue: after their families in their nations.

6 And the sons of Ham; Cush, and Mitzraim, and Phut, and Canaan.

7 And the sons of Cush; Seba, and Havilah, and Sabtah, and Raamah, and Sabtekah: and the sons of Raamah; Sheba, and Dedan.

were not servants. From which it is plain that this curse, which to this day is supposed to have been applied by Noah to his son Canaan, who was cursed for the crime of his father, can have no such application.

We have seen that the descendants of Ham all followed the idolatrous profession of their founder. It does not however appear that the descendants of Cush, Mitzraim, and Phut, were the first to establish idolatry, for the curse is particularly pronounced on Canaan. There is a marked singularity respecting Canaan the son of Ham. When they came out of the ark, it is said, verse 8, *and Ham is the father of Canaan*. Again, verse 22, the same remark is made, while the posterities of Shem and Japheth are not noticed. From all which it appears, that the sacred historian was instructed particularly to record both Ham and Canaan, because they were the first who promulgated idolatry after the deluge.

Now if it be recollected, that in the Hebrew scriptures, not only the grandsons are called *sons*, but also when the descent has been for many ages, they are so called, we shall understand the sense in which the venerable patriarch used the word Canaan as a collective noun singular: recollecting at the same time, that Canaan, the grandson, had established idolatry in the land of Canaan, in opposition to Noah, who had established the worship of God.

This was the crime meant by *nor was esher gnaasah*, i. e. *what he had done*; viz. *what he the Canaanitish people had done, against him*, in establishing the ancient abomination. The latter part of this verse therefore shews, that this curse was not pronounced on Canaan the son of Ham personally, but on Canaan, the people of Canaan, who were called by this patronymick name; and who became a *servant of servants* to his brethren, the descendants of Shem and Japheth.

This curse was delivered near 1000 years before it was accomplished, which was when the Hebrews were delivered from Egypt by the mighty power of God; and thus he fulfilled his decree on this idolatrous people, on Canaan, agreeably to the divine communication given to Noah. Then, and not until that period, did the curse fully operate on Canaan, when the Hebrews conquered the Canaanitish kings, abolished idolatry in the land of Canaan, and fulfilled the words of the patriarch by making those nations tributaries to them. Thus Canaan became a *servant of servants unto his brethren*; they all sprung from one common father, and he now became a *servant* to the Hebrews, who were servants to the Egyptians. Consequently, the whole of this part of the narrative respecting Noah, relates to the worship of God in the tabernacle, and this verse respecting Canaan, undeniably refers to the people of Canaan, against whom God communicated his displeasure to the patriarch.

26. *Blessed be the Lord God of Shem*. This is not consistent with the original; nor is this language allowable. The word *bless* means to make happy, to confer a favor. See also Acts xx. 35, *It is more blessed to give than to receive*. But it is

8 Now Cush begat Nimrod: he prophaned; to be mighty in the earth.

9 He was a mighty destroyer, in the presence of JEHOVAH; concerning which thing it shall be said; Like Nimrod the mighty destroyer in the presence of JEHOVAH.

10 Now the beginning of his kingdom was Babel, and Erech, and Accad, and Kalneh: in the land of Shinar.

not in the power of man to confer favours in this sense, and therefore this clause must be incorrect.

In the first place, there is no verb to be; and secondly, *nor Jehovah*, which is rendered *the Lord*, has not a prefix to sanction such a translation. There is no necessity for it, as the whole clause, agreeably to the Hebrew syntax, is the same as the English. It reads, *blessed of Jehovah God of Shem*. Thus Shem was the blessed of Jehovah, by being the immediate successor to the representative priesthood, as a type of Messiah; and this blessing was conferred, by his being accepted before the mercy-seat in the Holy of Holies, where he received the divine communication.

27. *God shall enlarge Japheth*. This is indefinite; we know not what can possibly be meant, *by God shall enlarge Japheth*. The narrative does not agree with this translation, for Japheth, as to his posterity, was not enlarged; both Ham and Shem were each far more numerous than Japheth.

The word *nor Japheth* is rendered *he shall enlarge*; it means to entice or persuade. See Job xxxii. 21. It has the same meaning under its corresponding root, *nor phathak*, Exod. xxii. 16; Deut. ii. 16; Jud. xiv. 15; 2 Sam. iii. 25; 1 Kings xxii. 20; Prov. i. 10. The clause reads, *God will persuade Japheth*; that is, induce him to oppose idolatry, and to abide by the worship of God. It then follows, *and he shall dwell in the tabernacles of Shem*. By which is meant, his being devoted to the priestly office.

8. *He began to be a mighty one in the earth*. That Nimrod was mighty may be allowed, but it is of little consequence to know that he began to be mighty. The word *begin*, is, in the authorised version, rendered by *began*; but the reader will find, by referring to other parts of scripture, that its true meaning is to prophane; Ezek. ix. 9;—xiv. 22, *that it should not be polluted*; Lev. xxi. 19, *she prophane herself*. This leads us to the true meaning and application; the clause then reads, *he prophaned to be mighty on the earth*. Here we have no words but what are in the original; but in the common version, the article *a*, and the substantive *one*, are put into the text in order to make it read. Thus we are also informed by the true reading, that Nimrod in order to be popular, *prophaned*; that is, committed *prophanation* by abolishing the true worship of God, and substituting that of idols. That is, he abolished the true worship of God, by turning the tabernacles where God communicated from between the Cherubim, into idolatrous temples.

9. *He was a mighty hunter before the Lord*. Objectors have, not without reason, found much fault with this passage, as it stands in all the versions. The phrase is common, being applied to men who are fond of hunting; but the scriptures do not contain things of so trivial a nature, so unconnected with subjects going before, and having no reference to any thing future. They treat of circumstances which lead to things of a spiritual nature, and I do not know a single passage in all the scriptures, where this

11 From this land he went forth to Assyria: there he built Nineveh, and the city Rehoboth, and Calah;

12 Also Resen, between Nineveh, and Calah: the same is a great city.

13 Moreover, Mitzraim begat Ludim, and Anamim, and Lehabim, and Naphtuhim.

14 Also the Pathrusim, and the Casluhim, and the Philistim, went forth from thence, and the Caphtorim.

15 Also Canaan begat Sidon his firstborn, and Heth.

16 And the Jebusite, and the Amorite, and the Girgasite.

17 And the Hivite, and the Arkite, and the Sinite.

18 And the Arvadite, and the Zemarite, and the Hamathite: then afterwards the families of the Canaanites dispersed.

19 Now the border of the Canaanites was from Sidon, in approaching Gerar, before Gaza: near Sodom, and Gomorrah, and Admah, and Zeboim, to Lasha.

20 These were the sons of Ham; by their families, after their tongues; in their countries, over their nations.

21 ¶ Now to Shem; the father of all the children of Eber, brother of Japheth the elder: also were born;

22 The children of Shem, Elam, and Asshur: also Arphaxad, and Lud, and Aram.

23 And the children of Aram; Uz, and Hul, and Gether, and Mash.

24 Now Arphaxad begat Salah; and Salah begat Eber.

25 Likewise to Eber were born, two sons: the name of the one Peleg, because in his days, the earth was divided; and the name of his brother, Joktan.

26 Moreover Joktan begat; Almodad, and Sheleph: also Hazarmaveth, and Jerah.

27 And Hadoram, and Uzal, and Diklah.

28 And Obal, and Abimael, and Sheba.

29 And Ophir, and Havilah, and Jobab: all these, were sons of Joktan.

30 Now their dwelling was, beyond Mesha; near Sephar, a mount of the east.

31 These were the sons of Shem; by their families, after their tongues, in their countries, after their nations.

32 These are the families of the sons of Noah, after their generations, in their nations: and

is exemplified in a more striking manner, than in this before us. The expression *before the Lord*, ought to have convinced the translators that it had no reference to hunting. In this part of scripture we have a short, but comprehensive description of the founders of the Babylonian, or great Assyrian empire; of which, it has been understood, Nimrod was one of the greatest, the most mighty, and the most arbitrary kings: who descended from Ham, and who began to introduce the idolatry of the old world, in opposition to the true worship of God.

As to the population of the world at this period, we have no certain or probable account given; it cannot be supposed that the families and names introduced, made up the population of all the countries and cities mentioned; the population at this time must have been great, or he could not have made the four great cities here spoken of, the principal cities of his kingdom, for this is the meaning. *וְהָיוּ* *Thei*, is not noticed in the common version, which means *revived*, caused to *live*, made *famous*, as the principals of his kingdom, *Babel*, and *Erech*, and *Accad*, and *Calah*. In the following verse it is said, *out of that land went forth Asshur, and builded Nineveh, and the city Rehoboth, and Calah, and Resen, the same is a great city*. The original reads as follows, *Out of that land he went forth to Assyria and builded Nineveh, and the city Rehoboth, and Calah, and Resen, the same is a great city*. By the translation we understand that a person of the name of Asshur, went forth and built these great cities; whereas it is obvious that the then reigning king, in order to extend his kingdom, went forth into Assyria, i. e. Assyria, and built these *הַגְּדֹלָהּ הַרְבֵּי חֲמִינֵי* *haagnid hagdolah, great cities*; which certainly could not have been built unless the population had been greater than is supposed; and

therefore it is evident that the principal governing families are only mentioned.

Nimrod is said in the translation to have descended from Cush the son of Ham, who was the great promulgator of idolatry in the east; and, as in all ages, professors when aided by power have disseminated their opinions, even by the sword, so Nimrod adopted those measures which were most likely to allure, or force the people to worship the idol of Babel. Accordingly the word *לָקַח* *Isayid*, is used, which means to *lie in wait*, to *pursue*, to *procure*, *provide*, according to idiom; either to destroy the body, or to entice the soul to sin; and this word has been rendered *hunter*; because hunters lie in wait to take, and destroy. That to *lie in wait*, or to *destroy*, is the primary meaning of the word is certain: Exod. xxi. 13, and if a man lie not in wait; 1 Sam. xxiv. 11, yet thou hunterest (Heb. *lie in wait for*) my soul to take it; Ezek. xx. 18; Zeph. iii. 6, their cities are destroyed. I have therefore rendered this clause *לָקַח גִּבּוֹר לָקַח* *gibor tsayid*, conformably to its radical meaning, thus—a *mighty destroyer*.

The word *לִפְנֵי* *liphnee*, is translated by *before*, which is the meaning of *לִפְנֵי* *liphnee*; but *phenex* is omitted in the translation. It literally means, the *face*, *countenance*, *person*, Job xxxiv. 19;—xxxii. 21; Lam. iv. 16; Lev. xix. 15. The passage reads, a *mighty destroyer in the presence of Jehovah*.

That this is the true sense of the clause must be obvious; for as it stands in all the translations, it can have neither meaning nor application. The king of Babel having acquired power, established idolatry, as a national religion, and he *laid wait*; to *allure*, *force*, or *destroy*, all who did not conform to his profession; which consisted in worshipping the host of heaven.

The latter clause is translated, *Wherefore it is said, as Nimrod*

from these the nations were separated in the earth after the deluge.

CHAP. XI.

MOREOVER, all the earth was one band, and of one speech.

2 Now it was when they journeyed from the east, that they found a valley in the land of Shinar, and they dwelt there.

the mighty hunter before the Lord. But the verb *yam-yecamar*, is not the preter, but the third person masculine singular future, of the verb to say, or declare.

לֹא־לֵךְ *Gnal keen*; the translators have rendered these words, *wherefore*; but *gnal*, properly means, *here, concerning*, Numb. viii. 22, *concerning the Levites*; 1 Kings xxii. 8, *concerning me*. And *keen*, which is as necessary as any other word, to ascertain the true meaning, is passed by unnoticed in the vulgar translation. It is used here in contempt and abhorrence, referring to the preceding acts of the cruelty of Nimrod, in destroying the true worshippers of God. The literal rendering is, *which thing*, see Gen. xxxiv. 7, *וְכֵן וְכֵן*, *which thing*. The clause reads thus, *Concerning which thing it shall be declared, Like Nimrod, a mighty destroyer of the persons of Jehovah.*

20. *In their countries, and in their nations.* Here we have an improper repetition, viz. *In their countries and in their nations*, is evidently the same. The original informs us, that these were not only the sons of Ham, but that these sons of Ham were governors, or kings *בְּנִימְרוֹד* *begoyeehem*, *over their nations*; for thus the preposition *בְּ* *beth*, should have been translated. We find then that the principal families were governors *over* the nations mentioned in the preceding verses; but in the common version, we only learn that these were the sons of Ham. Which indeed we had been told in the 6th verse; and consequently it would not have been repeated, without additional information, to countenance such a repetition.

32. *By these were the nations divided.* Here is a proof concerning what was mentioned above, viz. that at this period the population was great; for it is said, by these heads of the families were the nations divided after the deluge.

NOTES ON CHAP. XI.

1. The confusion of tongues is a subject which in all ages since the dispersion of the Jews, has been involved in great obscurity, nor have any of the voluminous comments with which we have been furnished, thrown that light upon it, which has either satisfied the objector, or the intelligent Christian.

There is nothing that appears more astonishing to a contemplative mind, than the origin and formation of different languages; but whether these wonderful communications were given instantaneously, whether they were implanted in man from the beginning, or whether a power was imparted to bring them into effect, in conformity with the necessities of man on account of local situations where circumstances and things might have a different effect on the organs of sense, so as to give birth to different modes of expression, it amounts to miracle. Because we cannot comprehend the going forth of that intelligent principle which produces thought, and manifests itself by vocal communication.

Most people are acquainted with the narrative as it stands in the translation, which states, that after the flood, *the whole earth was of one language, and of one speech*; that the people began to build a city and a tower whose top was to reach unto heaven,

3 Then they said every one to his neighbour, Come, we will make brick for buildings; which burn, even thoroughly: so they prepared for themselves, brick stone; and the clay, was among them for cement.

4 And they said, Come, we will build for us a city, and a tower with his top like heaven; thus shall be made for us a name: or we shall be scattered upon the face of all the earth.

lest they should be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth. But there is not any thing said in the translation that this was done in order that they might escape the fate of their predecessors, in case there should be another flood; which is the general belief at this day. It is only said, *Let us build us a city and a tower, whose top may reach unto heaven, and let us make us a name, lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth.* Thus it appears even in the common version, that the building was not for the purpose of enabling them to secure themselves in case of another flood, because it is expressly said, that their security was to arise from their MAKING TO THEMSELVES A NAME, which was to prevent them from being SCATTERED ABROAD UPON THE FACE OF THE WHOLE EARTH. Besides, when we for a moment consider how few, when compared with a nation, could be saved in a single tower, it will appear plain, that it was not intended to answer any such purpose.

From these considerations it will be allowed, that the Divine Being in his infinite wisdom, must have provided other means to confound the Babel builders, than by introducing many languages in a moment, for the purpose of putting an end to a building, whose top (it is said in the translation) was to reach to heaven. But what is still more extraordinary even than to inspire them with new languages in a moment, is, that they should in the same moment forget every word of the language they had hitherto known, and which was the only language in the world. I hope I shall be able to convince the learned on the one hand, as well as the intelligent reader on the other, by a close attention to the original, that the present translation of this part of scripture is very defective; that it altogether relates to a different subject, and which will justify me in forming an opinion very different from that which is generally received.

The received view of this subject as it now unfortunately stands in all the translations, operates against the religion of the Bible. The most strenuous advocates of the sacred volume can neither comprehend it, nor believe it; and it does them credit, because it is not contained in the original. While, on the other hand, it is one of those objections which render the Deist so formidable in his arguments against the scriptures.

Those who are disposed to give credit to popular opinion, without endeavouring to question its authority, when there is reason for so doing, may content themselves with thinking as their fathers have thought on this and other subjects of a similar nature. It was this kind of implicit faith, this accommodating servility to the opinions of others, unsupported by the authority of scripture, which bowed its pliant neck in obedience to what is called the authority of the fathers; which laid the foundation for opinions in religion, as inconsistent with the original, as the legends of the Koran are with common sense. Such credulous reasoners have done more injury to the religion of the Bible, than all the Infidels and Deists from the earliest ages.

I cannot see any thing of sanctity in this view of scripture. If we were to entertain no higher sentiments concerning it, than

5 When JEHOVAH descended; to examine the city, and the tower; which the sons of Adam builded;

that of building a tower whose top should reach unto heaven, to avoid the fate of a second deluge, and which, to put a stop to, required the interference of God in a way inconsistent with every idea we can form of his attributes; then there would be an end to all rational religion, and the Bible would be brought to a level with the *Tales of the Persian Soph.* But he who by his omniscience knows all things, who by his omnipotence and omnipresence is present to execute his will, had no necessity to come down from heaven in order to confound their language. Therefore I shall now proceed to shew, that this circumstance of building the tower of Babel, had reference to something of a more important nature than the building of a temple for the purpose stated in the translation.

This part of the history has also been involved in great obscurity respecting the first settlers after the time of Noah; therefore it is necessary to determine where the descendants of Ham and Shem settled, that the sequel of the narrative may apply with the greater effect; for as to the descendants of Japheth the record is more certain.

That part of the world assigned to Ham by the patriarch Noah, was divided among his sons: Cush had that division which afterward formed the Babylonian empire; Shem settled in that part of the world now called Persia, as appears from scripture; Persia was to the east of the dominions of Cush, and the province of Elam, in which the capital of the Persian empire is situated, was called Elam, after Elam the son of Shem. Chap. x. 22, *And Shem also the father of the children of Elam;* which retains that name to this day. This agrees also with what is said concerning the situation of the descendants of Shem in the 30th verse, *and their dwelling was from Mesha as thou goest unto Sephar a mount of the east.*

Hence it appears that the descendants of Ham were the original settlers at, and the builders of Babel; and consequently they were the people mentioned in the following chapter, who came from the east, and settled in the plain of Shinar. So far I am supported by scripture; but it is not an easy matter, nor is it necessary, to determine what number of these people from the east settled in Shinar; whether they came at different times, which is most probable, and for what reason they left their own country. I shall be as brief as possible in ascertaining these particulars as far as may be sanctioned by scripture.

The descendants of Shem appear to have founded twenty-six nations; but among all these, the worship of the true God was perpetuated only in the line of Arphaxad through eight generations to Abraham. And thus it was that Messiah should come in this line, as the true church had been preserved among them, and was continued to the line of David.

Thus we find that the posterity of Ham journeyed from thence, until they came to the plain of Shinar, where they had built the city, as mentioned in the preceding chapter, *to make themselves a name;* for idolatrous worship, to be the center of their union as a nation, and not to preserve them from a second flood. However, as this circumstance is recorded in sacred writ to have taken place far beyond the most remote period handed down to us in prophane history, we must have recourse to the ancient pages of the Bible for information: there we shall be furnished with that kind of evidence which will enable us to ascertain in what manner the confusion of tongues, as it is called, was accomplished. Some have been of opinion that

6 Then JEHOVAH said, Behold, another people, all of them with a vain lip; even at this time they prophane with offerings: and now

all the languages were given at the beginning: to such opinionists I answer, that the scripture denies this, for it is recorded at the time of the building of Babel, that *all the earth was of one language, and one speech;* from which we are authorized to declare, that the different languages were not given by the Creator at the beginning.

It is generally believed that the confusion of tongues was produced instantaneously, because it is said in the translation, *Go to, let us go down, and there confound their language, that they may not understand one another's speech.* In the fourth verse, the first clause stands thus in the translation, *And they said, Go to, let us build us a city and a tower.*

The word *u* *l* *kanon*, which follows *u* *l* *kanon* *u* *l* *kanon*, though it be translated by the oblique plural *us*, the preposition *l* *lamed*, which should have been rendered by the word *for*, is passed unnoticed, and even then a more proper word might have been chosen, with this construction. It reads very awkwardly in the translation, viz. *let us build us.* Had the translators noticed the preposition *l* *lamed*, they must then have rendered the passage, *let us build for us;* which even with this amendment is not passable, as it must appear to the intelligent reader that they did not mean to build for the other tribes. I need say nothing on the impropriety of the word *us* twice introduced, for which there is no authority in the Hebrew.

I now proceed to the latter part, *whose top may reach unto heaven:* but there are no words for *may reach* in the Hebrew; neither is there a subjunctive mood. The noun *rosh* *rasho* has the *v* *vav* prefixed and postfixed, which here supplies the ablative, and forms the pronoun possessive, and which is truly rendered *with his top.* The *beth* prefixed to *rosh* *shaumayim*, i. e. *heaven*, is rendered in other parts of scripture, with the same construction, by *like*; that is, *with his top*, or inside of the dome, like heaven. The scriptures inform us, that the idolaters worshipped the host of heaven, the primary object being the sun, and the secondary one the moon, under the form of a woman. From which, and other scripture proof we learn, that this tower was dedicated to the sun. The scripture also affords us information as to the manner of the worship of the idolaters; we read of *beth-shemesh*, i. e. *the house, or temple of the sun;* the *chariots of the sun;* the *horses of the sun;* and that they caused their children to pass before the fire, 2 Kings xvi. 3. That was *baaesh*, before the fire, which was burning on the idolatrous altar, where their sons passed before the idol; or in other words, the reigning kings, in order to obtain the ecclesiastical as well as the civil power, made their sons the priests.

Therefore the tower with his top or dome like heaven, can have no other application than to the figure of the heaven, with the heavenly bodies, the idols which they worshipped, the primary one, as observed, being the sun, i. e. an image representing the sun: the sacred writer uses the masculine pronoun, *rosh* *rasho*, his head. Thus were their subordinate idols, fancied figures, the signs of the zodiac, the continuation of the antediluvian idolatry, which represented the different seasons, and which by being placed in their temples at length were worshipped.

Go to. The word *haabaah*, is translated *go to*; but whatever signification these words had in our language 200 years since in the time of king James, they are now obsolete; we know not their meaning. It means to *give*, to *give a supply* of men,

shall nothing be restrained from them, all that they have imagined for offerings.

7 Come we will descend; and there confound

Deut. i. 18. *1271 haabow, supply, or give, come*, 2 Sam. xi. 15; Exod. i. 10. In the passage before us, where it has this meaning, we find that it has a reference to the government at Salem, afterwards *Jeru-salem*, which was at that very remote period the metropolis of the descendants of Shem, the worshippers of God. To a command, given in the customary way under that dispensation, from above the Cherubim, to go down to the plain, or country of Shinar, to put a stop to the growing system of the idolatry of these foreigners, the descendants of Ham. It is therefore more intelligibly translated by *come*, when it has reference to the place where the person is who speaks. See Exod. i. 10, to *give*, or *supply* power; or, to *go*, when it has reference to a distant place, where the thing mentioned is to be done.

Let us make us a name. We here learn that the descendants of Ham, who had now settled in the land of Shinar, were very numerous, otherwise they would not have attempted to have laid the foundation of a regular government, which though at that period did not succeed; yet when the true worship of God began to be neglected in the line of Shem, the descendants of Ham, who still lived in the land, succeeded in establishing a mighty empire. The design of these settlers, we learn from the words *וְנִשְׁמָעָה לָנוּ שֵׁם*, *venagmaseh l'nanu sheem*, which we will make for our renown. But the government in the line of Shem, being at this period greater in power, put a stop, not only to idolatry, but also to the establishment of a government, which was intended should reach to the border of the land of Canaan.

וְנִשְׁמָעָה, *is generally translated by name*, and not improperly, though a better word might have been chosen in this passage. For it was applied to individuals, or nations, who were famous, or had gotten great fame; this is the true meaning of the word, in this and other passages. 1 Chron. xxii. 5, of fame;—v. 24, famous; Gen. vi. 4, renown; Ezek. xxii. 5, infamous;—xxxiii. 13, renown; Zeph. iii. 19, fame.

The whole verse in connexion reads; AND THEY SAID, COME, WE WILL BUILD FOR US A CITY AND A TOWER, WITH HIS HEAD LIKE HEAVEN, WHICH WE WILL MAKE FOR OUR RENOWN. The last clause then applies with proper effect, viz. *or we shall be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth.* The word *וְנִשְׁמָעָה*, rendered *name*, means the nature of the person, place, or circumstance introduced. Gen. xvi. 13, and she called the name of the Lord; Thou God seest me;—xxii. 14, and Abraham called the name of the place *Jehovah-Jireh*;—xxvi. 20, 33;—xli. 45, 51, 52. This will shew that idolatry was the great abomination of the old world, and that this city was built for the same profession, or order of worship. For the same word which is here applied to these idolaters to make them famous, is applied also to those who before the deluge are called, in the authorised version, ch. vi. 4, *giants, sons of God, men of renown.* It is easy therefore to account for that preference which was given to the religion of their progenitor Ham, in opposition to the worship of the true God; which was strictly observed among the posterity of Shem and Japheth. For Babel was built to be the center of their empire, to combine them together; and the tower was erected for idolatrous worship, which was to be the bond of their union, lest they should be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth.

Thus it is evident that the subject here introduced by the sacred penman was not concerning the confusion of tongues, so

their doctrines: for a man shall not hearken, to the speech of his neighbour.

8 So JEHOVAH dispersed them from thence,

called, but concerning the doctrines, or opinions then entertained respecting their mode of worship. The posterity of Ham introduced the old worship of idols, (as above) and therefore a difference of opinion as to the form of these idols, and the meaning and application of the doctrines resulting from the adoption of them, separated them into different societies. To prevent which they had formed a plan for unity in their worship, to the total exclusion of all who should presume to make any variation in this ancient antediluvian idolatry. This was the reason why the apostle was directed in Rev. xvii. 8, to call this kind of overwhelming dominion, *BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS, AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH.* Thus arose, first the different sects, viz. from the family of Canaan, the Canaanite, Jebusite, Amorite, Gurgasite, Ivite, Arkite, Hamathite, Sinite, Arvadite, Zarnothite, Philistine. These families, or sects, formed villages, towns, districts, nations, and empires; as appears from scripture. Hence we find in the time of the judges, immediately after the death of Joshua, that the posterity of Ham preserved their ancient policy; for though they formed different nations, yet they were all idolaters, forming so many different sects of the same profession. See Jud. i. 27, 29, 30, 31, 32.

Neither did Manasseh drive out the inhabitants of Beth-shean (temple of the returning year) and her towns; nor Taanach (temple of influences) and her towns; nor the inhabitants of Dor (temple of the circle, i. e. the zodiac) and her towns; nor the inhabitants of Ibleam (swallow, devourer) and her towns; nor the inhabitants of Megiddo (temple of precious fruits) and her towns. Neither did Naphtali drive out the inhabitants of Beth-shelesh (temple of the solar light) nor the inhabitants of Beth-anath (temple of time.) Neither did Zebulun drive out the inhabitants of Kilton (incense), nor the inhabitants of Nahalol (praise.)

Hence in process of time, an alteration in their pronunciation took place, arising from a variety of causes, circumstances, and things, in each country; calling for a different mode of expression; and from which undoubtedly arose the various languages. It cannot be denied that a difference of sentiment would produce a separation from the great body of the people; it has been the same in all ages; for which reason we see so many professing sects at this day, each forming a separate community. And if we attend to the singular expressions made use of among many Christian sects, we shall find phrases peculiar to their own creeds, many of which cannot be understood but by those who are of the same sect. *NEW SHAPPAH ACHAH, some lip.* The same is observable in the different dialects of England. In Yorkshire they say, *o't me'er as*, which being interpreted, is, *I shall never offer*; in Derbyshire, *com mon w't g't t'grooves t'de*; *come man wilt thou go to the mines to day?* in Lancashire, *What me'y's o'trough on so dane kest*; *What makes that sigh and so down cast?* It follows in the 8th verse, *so the Lord scattered them abroad from thence upon the face of all the earth.* That is, in his providence he permitted a difference of opinion to take place among them, in order to bring about by his agent, man, the abolition of idolatry, which threatened the total overthrow of the true worship of God.

That this is the order God has established in creation and providence, is plain. The order in nature is progressive; the seasons have their appointed time, summer and winter, seed-time and harvest; the fruits are produced in progressive order;

upon the face of all the earth: thus they ceased, to build the city.

nature is not magical, but step by step proceeds to the full accomplishment of that perfection, with which she has been endowed by the Creator. In the order of providence, when God called Abraham from the land of the idolatrous Babylonians, he was informed that those great things which were to be done, were not to take place in a moment, that the idolatry of the nations was not to be overthrown in his lifetime: which seems to have been the opinion of the patriarch; or where was the necessity for his being told concerning the time, and the reason for the delay? Gen. xv. 13, 16, *And he said unto Abraham, Know of a surety, that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them, and they shall afflict them four hundred years. But in the fourth generation they shall come hither again; for the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full.* So in like manner it will appear that the confusion of tongues, so called, which has been a subject for ridicule for many ages among infidels, was not effected in a moment, as has been, and as it is understood at this day.

This view is also confirmed from the following part of the narrative, where after this circumstance had taken place, and they had separated themselves into different societies; the true worship of God in the line of Shem from whom the Messiah was to come, is introduced, and the succession agreeably to the law of primogeniture continued to Abraham.

This will lead us to a true understanding and application of that part, where God is said to go down, and to confound their speech, ver. 11, 12. But this question has often been asked, "To whom were these words spoken? and how should the writer, Moses, know that these words were spoken by the Lord? for as they were spoken above a thousand years before the time of Moses, it is not at all likely that he should know the verbal particulars, admitting they had been spoken by the Lord." If the inquiring reader will turn to the scriptures, he may soon satisfy himself, not only to whom these words were addressed, but also, how it was that Moses knew the particulars of this communication, of which below.

5. The word *וַיַּעַר* *Vayeer, Jehonah, And the Lord came down*, is improper; it means to descend, and always in every part of scripture, when applied to God, signifies, and he descended, that the incommunicable principles of Deity descended, viz. by his omnipresence, and omniscience: or as it is expressed in another place, Prov. xv. 3, *The eyes of the Lord are in every place, beholding the evil and the good.*

וַיִּבְרָא *Liroth, to behold*, is a personification of the divine attributes—descended to communicate his will from between the Cherubim. For the word *וַיִּבְרָא* *Jehovah*, as above, means the esse, or inmost of Deity.

6. In this verse *וַיִּבְרָא* *gnau achaad*, is rendered in the translation, *the people is one*. But there is no necessity for supplying the third person of the verb is, neither do we want the *is* prefixed to *gnau*, in order to read it *the people*. There is no authority in the Hebrew for such an unwarrantable liberty; it reads far better as the sacred writer has left it.

וַיִּבְרָא *Echaad*, in this verse, according to rule, is to be rendered by the word, *another*. See Exod. xxxvii. 8; 1 Sam. xviii. 16; 1 Kings xviii. 6; Ezek. xvii. 17;—xix. 5;—xxxvii. 16, 17;—xli. 11; Dan. viii. 13.

The next word in this verse which is improperly rendered, is *וַיִּבְרָא* *lagnasoth*; it is not intelligible in the translation, viz. *this they began to do*; but we are not told what it was they began to do: whereas the original is plain and express. *וַיִּבְרָא*

9 Therefore he called the name of it Babel; because there *JEHOVAH* confounded, the doctrines

hachilam, is in the authorised version translated, *they begin*, but it means to prophane, as was observed ch. x. 6. See also Lev. x. 10, *unholy*; Ezek. xxi. 25, *prophane*;—xlviii. 15. *וַיִּבְרָא* *Lagnasoth*, means to offer, and in this passage, *offerings to idols*, as it is so applied, Josh. xxii. 23. *וַיִּבְרָא* or *if to offer*. 2 Kings x. 24, 25, *sacrifices and burnt offerings*. From which it is evident that these Babel-builders are here said to have made *prophane offerings*; which shews that these prophane offerings were made to their idols, which profanity began with Ham, and was handed down to his posterity the Canaanites, to the time of Moses.

The last clause reads in the translation thus; *And now nothing will be restrained which they have imagined to do*. But this is not applicable to any thing they might have imagined, or purposed to do; we are not told in the translation whether their imaginations were good or evil, it is indefinite; but in the original the nature of their imaginations is mentioned. This omission is occasioned by the improper translation of *וַיִּבְרָא* *Yaazmon*, viz. *which they have imagined*. This word means *evil imagination*. Lev. xviii. 17, *wickedness*; Jud. xx. 6, *Leudness*; Job xxxi. 11, *an heinous crime*; Psalm xvi. 10, &c. Which shews that the translation of *וַיִּבְרָא* *hachilam*, to profane, is right.

But the first word of the last proposition in the common version *וַיִּבְרָא* *kol, all*; has been omitted by the translators. Besides, the obvious sense of the passage is not true, viz. *that nothing should be restrained from them*; for we find that a stop was immediately put to the whole of their idolatrous plan. The latter part of this verse, after the major proposition, reads; *And now shall nothing be withheld from them, in all they imagine for offerings*.

Thus we see that the word *וַיִּבְרָא* *lagnasoth*, evidently means, their idolatrous offerings; for the words, *nothing they have imagined to do*, have too great a latitude, as they might have, no doubt, imagined to do many things which were proper to be done.

7. *Let us go down*. No one having a true conception of the majesty of heaven, as far as finite minds are permitted to form ideas of him, can for a moment suppose that it was necessary for God, who fills the universe with his presence, of whom it is said, *the heaven of heavens cannot contain thee*; to descend in order to see the city, and to learn what the inhabitants were doing. Nothing can be unknown to the omniscient, omnipresent *Jehovah*! This therefore cannot possibly be understood as objectors have said the scriptures define it; viz. that God literally came down in order that he might see and know the particulars which were transacting at Babel.

The word *וַיִּבְרָא* *neerdak*, which is rendered, *let us go down*, is certainly not used in the optative mood here, nothing expressive of wish, desire, or encouragement, can possibly be allowed as the ground of agreement between God and man. When any thing was necessary to be done which called for the exertion of Almighty power, it was only for him to will it, and it was done. We cannot, I say, suppose, in a matter which required the interference of Almighty power, that God would use this language, as it would imply a power on the part of the creature, capable of resisting the operations of the Creator. This word is the first person plural future, viz. *we will descend*. Besides, the word *let*, is one of the most improper words that could have been chosen; it comes from the Saxon *letan*; and as a verb, the true import is, first, to admit, secondly, to hinder.

of all the earth; then from thence JEHOVAH dispersed them, upon the face of the earth.

10 ¶ These *are* generations of Shem; Shem, was an hundred years old, when he begat Arphaxad; two years after the deluge.

11 Thus Shem lived, after the birth of Arphaxad; five hundred years: and he begat sons and daughters.

When it applies to the first, it is in the preter, and participle passive; when to the second, it has *letted*.

Let may be used before any word in the passive voice, and then it becomes imperative; but *neerdah*, can have no such rendering in conjunction with *us*; for before the first person plural, it conveys the idea of *exhortation, persuasion*; to *permit* something to be done. But (as above) it cannot be allowed that God would use the language of persuasion to finite beings, saying, *let us go down*. So it would be the highest presumption in angels, as it would be the greatest absurdity in man to suppose, that finite beings could possibly interfere in the execution of these things, which, had they been done, must evidently have been accomplished by infinite wisdom and Almighty power.

And there confound their speech. The word *shephaathaam*, is translated *their speech*. But this is not the primary meaning of the word, which the sacred writer here intended to convey, as we shall find by referring to other places where this root is used. See Eccles. x. 12, *The lips (doctrines) of a fool, (Heb. perverse) will swallow up himself*. It is plain that there is neither harmony nor truth in the common version here: but the idolatrous doctrines to which the allusion was made, brought the professors into distress and ruin. Isa. xxx. 27, *his lips (doctrines) are full of indignation, and his tongue as a devouring fire*; ch. xlix. 3, *your lips (doctrines) have spoken lies, your tongue hath muttered perverseness*. It must be evident that such repetitions as, *lips full of indignation, and tongues as a devouring fire—lips speaking lies, and tongues muttering deceit*, are not allowable, they are not to be found in the original.

Sam. iii. 61, 62. *Thou hast heard the lips, (doctrines:) here it is also plain, that the doctrines, or principles, of the idolatrous professors, were referred to. Prov. xxxi. 18. Let the lying lips (doctrines) be put to silence;—x. 32, The lips (doctrines) of the righteous know what is acceptable;—xii. 22, lying lips (doctrines) are an abomination to the Lord. The lip is not an abomination, because it is the work of his hand; but the idolatrous doctrines which were held forth by the people, were the abomination here mentioned. From which it is sufficiently evident, that the word *shephaathaam*, did not mean *their language*, which is here said to have been confounded; but *their doctrines, or idolatrous principles*, which were not permitted to be promulgated. And thus by the divine communication at Salem, they were commanded to go down, and put a stop to the idolatry of these foreigners; lest the true worshippers of God should be deluded by their doctrines.*

That they may not understand. This passage as it stands in the common version, first represents God as having given man a freewill, by the abuse of which he brought himself into the situation described; it then supposes that his freewill was taken away, and that *stumbling-blocks were laid before him*, as it is erroneously translated, Jer. xi. 21, in order that he might fall and perish. Thus we understand by the common version, that in a moment they heard from each party a different language,

12 ¶ Now Arphaxad lived, five and thirty years; and he begat Salah.

13 Thus Arphaxad lived, after the birth of Salah; four hundred and three years: and he begat sons and daughters.

14 ¶ Also Salah lived thirty years, and he begat Eber.

15 And Salah lived, after the birth of Eber;

so that they could have no communication with each other; and all this is said in the translations to be, for the express purpose, of putting a stop to the building of a tower, or temple, to save them from the fate of another flood; which (as observed) would not have saved the one-thousandth part of one populous city. Let the learned and the intelligent reader look through the whole narrative, as it stands in the common version, and they will, if in search of truth, blush for the credit of the Bible; and be shocked at a translation, which will be found so inconsistent with the original.

The word *yishmengau*, has by the translators been rendered to *understand*; and the reason will be plain; for the translators having from the translation of Jerome, supposed that these words were spoken by God to angels, have also with him concluded, that God came down with his angels, and confounded their language; and thus put a stop to their building and produced the different languages; on which account they could not understand one another's speech. Had the translators given the word its true meaning, it would have convinced them that the application of the word *vayesered*, rendered *and he came down*, was not to God, but to those with whom the divine communication was made at the temple by the Cherubim at Salem.

This word truly means to *hearken, to hear, to obey*; with this form and construction it cannot be rendered to *understand*, and it is very singular that the translators should in this solitary passage only, have translated it *understand*; when, throughout the sacred volume, wherever they found this word, they have regularly given it the true reading, to *hearken, hear, obey*. I need not quote the passages where this form of the verb occurs. I believe I have examined every one, amounting to sixty-five; where they are found uniformly to have their true reading. There is also another error made by the translators in the translation of this word. It cannot be rendered in the subjunctive mood, as they have rendered it, because there is no such mood in Hebrew, as observed; it is the third person plural future in *kal*, with the negative *lo*, and the conjunction *asher*, i. e. *which*.

Reegneeu, is omitted in the translation, and a very uncouth reading is given to the two preceding words *shephath, one another's speech*. *Reegneeu*, literally means *his neighbour*; and when it is taken into the translation, the clause reads, *the doctrine, or conversation of his neighbour*. The verse in connexion reads literally thus, *Come, we will descend, and there confound their doctrines: for the man shall not hearken to the speech of his neighbour*.

From what is said, there can be no objection to the fifth verse as it stands in the translation; for that God descends in his providence cannot be denied by any rational man. I therefore have given the above reading of the 4th 5th, 6th, and 7th verses, agreeably to the true sense of the original Hebrew.

This was a communication in the way that God had appointed under that dispensation, from between the Cherubim. And

four hundred and three years: and he begat sons and daughters.

16 ¶ Also Eber lived, four and thirty years; and he begat Peleg.

17 And Eber lived after the birth of Peleg; four hundred and thirty years; and he begat sons and daughters.

18 ¶ Now Peleg lived, thirty years; and he begat Reu.

19 And Peleg lived, after the birth of Reu; two hundred and nine years: and he begat sons and daughters.

agreeably to this order of things in after-time, we find that the Cherubim, the Shechinah, the Urim and Thummim, were continued under the Mosaic dispensation, and that by these divine symbols, God communicated his will. Now as the divine goodness had by these symbols of his presence communed with man from the fall, so likewise when he established the covenant with Noah, they were continued as the appointed means of communication. Thus they remained with the visible church of God, among the descendants of Shem, in whose line Messiah was to come: by these divine symbols, God descended to give his commands, and thus he communicated his will respecting the idolatrous worshippers at Babel, to the visible head of the church at Salem. Salem was the ancient name of Jeru-salem: David referring to those ancient times says, *SALEM also is (was) his habitation*; this was 600 years before the time of Moses, in the time of Melchizedek, of whom it is said, *and Melchizedek king of Salem, brought forth bread and wine: and he was the priest of the most high God—the temporal head of the true church of God at Salem, and as such was acknowledged by the venerable patriarch Abraham. Thus he was called the priest of the most high God, in opposition to the idolatrous priests, who had a number of gods, but were not priests of the most high God. This shows the propriety as to this distinction at that period, though many have objected to it, saying the term most high was unnecessary.*

9. בבל Baalal, in the 9th verse, is translated *confound*; it has the sense of *mingling*, or *mixing*, Exod. xxix. 40; Lev. xiv. 21; Numb. xv. 4, 9; Hosea vii. 8. As the passage has respect to the abolition of idolatry, by mixing these people with the true worshippers of God in various parts of the land, it is consistent with the original import of the root.

נשן Shephoth in the same verse is translated *language*; it means to *set in order*; 2 Kings iv. 38, *set us*; Ezek. xxiv. 8, *set*, or more properly *place in order*. To *set in order*, or *make peace between two parties*; Isaiah xxvi. 12, *ordain peace*.

From these considerations it will appear that all the objections which have been made to the phrase, *and the Lord came down*,

20 ¶ Now Reu lived, two and thirty years; and he begat Serug.

21 So Reu lived, after the birth of Serug; two hundred and seven years: and he begat sons and daughters.

22 ¶ And Serug lived, thirty years; and he begat Nahor.

23 So Serug lived, after the birth of Nahor; two hundred years: and he begat sons and daughters.

24 ¶ Now Nahor lived, nine and twenty years; and he begat Terah.

vanish. It must be allowed by every thinking man, that God is present in all places, at the same time, because he only possesses ubiquity; and as man can have no adequate conception of this divine attribute, and for the best of reasons, because it is infinite, the scripture language is accommodated to his understanding. And therefore to those who believe in the Divine providence, having their minds elevated to him who dwells in the heavens, this passage is by them so understood; that he descended agreeably to the order of that dispensation he had ordained for the church in the time of Noah, and communicated his will respecting the idolatrous Babylonians, from between the Cherubim; which order, as is noticed above, was continued to the time of the Babylonish captivity, when the divine theocracy ceased.

Now the application of the words, even as they stand in the translation, is obvious. The ancient city Salem was the capital city of the then existing government of the numerous descendants of Shem, who were worshippers of the *LIVING GOD*; but the people here mentioned, who journeyed to the plain of Shinar, was גמל עמל gnam echaad, another people, viz. the descendants of Ham, the worshippers of idols, who are on that account called *another people*. And that the true church should not be destroyed by the worship of those new settlers from the east, the people of Salem were directed by the communication from the Cherubim, to go down to Babel, and there to confound their vain words. By doing this, they broke in pieces their union, destroyed the idolatry, which these descendants of Ham were introducing, and scattered them from that place, by בבל baalal, mixing them among the true worshippers נשן by נשן gnat pence kaal haarets, upon the face of all the earth.

Hence it appears that there is no necessity for supposing, that God spake to angels, or that he came down literally from heaven; this would be to undignify the Creator; but it was done in the way he had appointed from the beginning, viz. from between the Cherubim. This order of communication, as observed, was continued down to the time of Abraham and to Moses, who received this part of scripture from the descendants of those very ancient predecessors, the antediluvian Patriarchs.

As to the Hebrew, it has been incorporated into all languages: we have a great number of Hebrew words in English, and in the Welsh are found whole sentences purely Hebrew:

Iam. ii. 2. . . . Billang Adona lo chaamal eth Bal neaoth Jagnkob. Welch. By-llwng adon- ydh holl neweth Jago. English. The Lord hath swallowed up all the tabernacles of Jacob.

Hebrew. Derek bethah itengad. Welch. Dyrcad buth hi ai-i sengyd. English. The road of her house he would tread.

Psa. xxiv. 8. Mi houn zeh melech hakaabod Jehovah webaath, houn melech hakaabod. Selah. Welch. Py yw-o ry maeloc y-awad I-a-ywuo sawyod, yw-o maeloc y-cawad. Sela. English. Who is the King of glory? the Lord of hosts, he is the King of glory. Selah.

Hebrew. Magen gwol Elohyim. Welch. Meigen-i kuryl Elyv. English. My shield is of God. See Ann.Reg. 1805.p.887.

25 Also Nahor lived, after the birth of Terah; an hundred and nineteen years: and he begat sons and daughters.

26 ¶ And Terah lived, seventy years; and he begat Abram, Nahor and Haran.

27 Moreover, these are generations of Terah, Terah begat Abram, Nahor, and Haran; now Haran begat Lot.

28 But Haran, died in the presence of Terah

26. *Terah lived seventy years and begat Abram, Nahor and Haran.* From this statement it is evident, either that Abram was not the firstborn, or that this removal from Haran after the death of Terah, was not his final removal; for seventy years, the age of Terah, and seventy-five years, the age of Abram, when he is said to have left Haran, make but 145 years; whereas it is said that Terah lived 205 years, ch. xi. 32. Jerome, (in Quest. Heb.) and Austin, (de Civit. Dei. l. 16. c. 15.) among the ancients, and Scaliger among the moderns, have concluded, that these passages cannot be reconciled. Others have attempted to solve the difficulty by allowing Terah to have been 130 years old at the birth of Abram; but he could not possibly be the eldest son, having married a daughter of his brother Haran, and that daughter only ten years younger than himself.

Among those who countenance this opinion, are Capellus, Beroaldus, Sallan, Musculus, Pareus, Cajitan, Calvin, Mariyr, H. Philippi, Usher, Isaac Vossius, Hales, &c. But there is an objection to this; for if Terah was 130 years old when Abram was born, would he have said with surprise, ch. xvii. 17, *Shall a child be born to him that is an hundred years old?* Or would Paul have spoken of Abram's body being now dead at the age of 100, and of the greatness of his faith in not staggering at the promise of God through unbelief? Rom. xix. 20.

But that Abram was not the firstborn is evident, from his brother having a daughter when he was only ten years of age; and it is surprising how this fact could escape the notice of so many learned and eminent commentators. So that for these reasons it is as certain that when he was born, his father Terah was not 130 years of age.

It will be seen that his removal from Haran, when he was 75 years old, was before the death of Terah, as the call of God required him to go forth with his own family, from the household of his father; which could not with any propriety have been said, if his father had not been living. We have evidence from the use of the pluperfect tense, or the remote preter, that he had passed through the land, at an early part of his life, a circumstance not suspected by those who have urged the difficulties, and who have, by endeavouring to solve them, proposed greater. This being the fact, there is not any thing strange, after his first journey, where he preached, and taught the worship of God, that he at 75 went and took up his residence in Canaan; and on the death of his father finally departed from Haran.

As the intention of the sacred historian was to trace the lineage of the Messiah, it does not require that the date of the birth of any other of Terah's children should have been noticed. And therefore we shall find that the birth of Abram, when Terah was 70 years old, is what is asserted in this verse. For if we look at the seven preceding generations from Shem, we see that every one of them had their firstborn, when they were from 29 to 35 years of age; and as this was the custom of the patriarchs, it is reasonable to conclude that the father of Abram would marry at the usual period. All the uncertain conclusions

his father; in the land of his nativity, in Ur of the Chaldees.

29 Now Abram, and Nahor had taken for themselves, women: the name of the wife of Abram, was Sarai; and the name of the wife of Nahor, was Milcah; daughter of Haran, father of Milcah, and father of Iscah.

30 But Sarah had no child: she was barren.

31 Now Terah had taken Abram his son, and

which have been drawn respecting this matter, would have been unnecessary had the translators known, that the Hebrew, as well as all other languages, contains a pluperfect, or a remote preter tense. This is not only obvious from the sense of passages, but from the undeviating rule of the language, when the accents are attended to, and which rule has been neglected even by eminent Hebrew scholars.

We find then that the word *terah* was joined, which in the common version is translated *and begat*, is the pluperfect of the verb, and should be translated *when he had begotten*, viz. *when he had begotten Abram*, he was seventy years old. Here the point *katon*, divides Abram from Nahor and Haran; from which it appears that Abram was the youngest son, and that he was born when Terah was seventy years old.

27. *Now these are the generations of Terah.* Every circumstance recorded concerning the patriarchs from the flood, was intended to shew the genealogy of the Messiah, who was to appear in the holy line from Seth. The sacred historian is particular in giving the genealogy briefly to the time of Terah the father of Abram; he is then more copious, as the renewal of the dispensation was to be given to him, which was to form the basis of the last state of the representative dispensation, before the coming of the Messiah.

28. *Haran died before his father.* It is said that he died in Ur, and that he left a son and two daughters: Ur was situated in Mesopotamia, a district of Chaldea, ch. xix.

30. Abram and Nahor married their nieces, the daughters of Haran, viz. Iscah, or Sarah, and Milcah.

31. *Now Terah took Abram.* The translators of the authorized version have not noticed the pluperfect, or remote preter in this verse; and throughout a great part of the following chapter. It is indispensably necessary to attend to it, in order to obtain a right understanding of the circumstances and things recorded. *Terah had taken them*; at a period prior to something already stated; and he had removed from Ur, intending to go to the land of Canaan; but he stayed in Haran, and there he died.

NOTES ON CHAP. XII.

1. *Now the Lord had said unto Abram.* In the common version we find here that the pluperfect, or remote preter tense has been properly noticed, for it refers to a time anterior to the removal of Terah from Ur. In Acts vii. 2, we are informed, that the calling of Abram was, while he was yet in Mesopotamia, before the removal of the family to Haran. Expositors have found many difficulties in their attempts to elucidate this part of the patriarchal history; but, as was above said, it will be seen, that Abram had several journeys to Canaan, before his final removal to that land.

Commentators have in general concluded, that Abram did not go to Canaan till after the death of Terah, and that he was then 75 years old. But had this been the case, it would be manifest that he had not complied with the call, when it was said, *Depart, go from thy land, and from thy kindred, and from the house of*

Lot the son of Haran, the son of his son; also Sarai his daughter-in-law; the wife of Abram his son: thus they went forth together from Aour of the Chaldees, to go into the land of Canaan; so they came to Haran; and dwelt there.

32 Now the days of Terah were; two hundred and five years: when Terah died in Haran.

CHAP. XII.

NOW JEHOVAH had said to Abram; Go forth from thy land, also from thy kindred, and from the household of thy father; to the land which I will shew thee:

2 For I will make of thee even a great nation, yea I will bless thee; also I will magnify thy name: which shall be a blessing.

thy father. Here are three injunctions, the *kindred*, and the *household* must not be confounded, by the removal of Terah to Haran; the first and second injunctions were complied with; but had Abram never gone into Canaan till after the death of Terah, it could not, according to the express words of scripture, be said, that he had *gone forth from the household of his father*; for the household of a man has no existence as his, after his death. Abram must therefore have *gone forth* to Canaan while his father was yet living, though his final removal from Haran did not take place till after the death of Terah. The verb being in the pluperfect, or remote preter, *had said*; the *van* should be rendered adversatively, *but—but Jehovah had said*; intimating that Abram did not continue with his father; for *Jehovah had said*, *Go forth from the household of thy father*. The verbs *לָקַח* *leke*, *לָקַח* *leke*, *depart*, *go*, do not necessarily import that he was at this period, to remove finally to Canaan; but when Abram went from Haran finally at 75 years of age after the death of Terah, a different verb is used, which embraces the idea of going forth finally, returning not to the same state or place. See Gen. viii. 19; Exod. xxi. 2, 22; Lev. xxv. 41; Deut. xiii. 13; Josh. v. 6, 8c. But if he were not now to remove finally, what is meant to be intimated in the text, ver. 1? Let the text speak for itself—*Go forth unto the land which I will shew thee*: God said he would shew him the land. The going forth therefore of Abram from the household of his father, was to see the land, where his posterity was to become a *great nation*, ver. 2. And we shall see, that under the divine guidance, this mission, and promise were connected with, and depended on an arduous work, requiring great activity both of body and mind, even a great degree of labour, not at all suited to a person of 75 years of age; viz. preaching the word of God to all the idolatrous nations of Canaan: for the purpose of the mission of Abram to Canaan has been overlooked. In conformity with this, it is plain from the 3d and 4th verses of the next chapter, that Abram went to Canaan at a far more early period, when he was a young man; as it is said, *Where his tabernacle had been at the beginning—The altar which he had made there at the first*. But there is another proof that Abram went to the land of Canaan when he was a young man, which is conclusive, viz. it is not possible that Sarah at the advanced age of near seventy years, could have been so youthful and beautiful, as to have induced the courtiers of the king to have selected her for him. See on verse 11th.

3 Moreover I will bless *them* that bless thee; but whoso curseth thee, I will curse: for by thee, all the families of the earth shall be blessed.

4 Now Abram departed, as JEHOVAH had spoken to him; also Lot went with him: but Abram was seventy and five years old, when he removed from Haran.

5 Then Abram took Sarai his wife, and Lot the son of his brother, with all the substance that they had gathered; also the persons that they had procured in Haran: then they went forth proceeding to the land of Canaan; and they came to the land of Canaan.

6 Moreover Abram passed through the land, to the place of Sichem; to the plain of Moreh: for that Canaanite *was* then over the land.

2, 3. The blessing pronounced to Abram, and through him to all the families of the earth, has an evident reference to the Messiah who was to descend from him.

4. *So Abram departed, as the Lord had spoken unto him, and Lot went with him.* The going here ascribed to Abram, is expressed by the same radical word, as the command to go forth, ver. 1: the two are perfectly reciprocal, and the action itself is removed to the remote preter by being referred to what *the Lord had spoken*, at an anterior time, viz. while Abram was in Mesopotamia, at Ur, while he was a young man. Notice the antithesis—at the remote time alluded to, *Abram had gone*; in his younger days as he was commanded, also Lot went with him. But *when he departed*, i. e. finally, the act is expressed, not in the remote, but in the common preter, and he was then 75 years old. At this removal he took with him the whole family, including the servants they had procured in Haran. These words, *and Lot went with him*, have therefore reference to his first journey to Canaan, as may be seen by the 31st verse of the preceding chapter, when after the command was given to Abram, Terah took them all and went on the way to Canaan, but stopped at Haran, where the rest of the family abode until the death of Terah. The 12th chapter ought to commence at the middle of the 4th verse. The construction is peculiar, the common version says, *and Abram was seventy-five*: but the *van* is *adversative*, which has reference to his finally quitting Haran after the death of Terah, viz. *But Abram was seventy-five*.

6. *And the Canaanite was then in the land.* Objectors have fixed on this verse as it stands in the common version, to prove that Moses was not the writer of the book of Genesis. "When this book was written (say they) the Canaanites must have been previously expelled, for so the words, *the Canaanite was then in the land*, certainly signify."

The text says that Abram had *passed through the land to the place of Sichem, to the plain of Moreh*. This plain, or district of the country, then belonged to a person of the name of Moreh, who was a Canaanite. But the word Canaanite, here does not refer to the Canaanite as a people; the *ת* *ha*, prefixed to this word is rendered *the*, viz. *the Canaanite*; but it refers to the man Moreh, and should be rendered by the demonstrative pronoun *that*. Also the *ב* *bet*, prefixed to *ארץ* *erets*, *the land*, is a preposition, having respect to dignity of situation; it refers to Moreh, who in the time of Abram was *over*, or *governed* that district, which

7 There JEHOVAH had appeared to Abram, when he said, To thy posterity, I will give this land: for he built there an altar before JEHOVAH, who appeared to him.

8 Moreover he had removed from thence to a mountain, eastward of Beth-el, where he pitched his tabernacle: Beth-el by the sea, with Hai eastward; for he had built there an altar, before JEHOVAH; where he preached in the name of JEHOVAH.

9 Thus Abram journeyed; going yet forward, to the south.

was called by his name. See where *2 Beth*, has this rendering, Jud. viii. 23, *over*. Thus in the time of Jacob, Shechem the Hivite had succeeded as governor of that part of the land; and so these lands were continually changing hands, among the original possessors, for the Canaanite had been in the land from the time of Canaan the son of Ham, who settled in this land, and whose descendants were called after him.

7. *And the Lord appeared unto Abram.* When he had commanded him to go forth, ver. 1; at his first journey, and not at his final departure when he was 75 years old, as is supposed. This verse mentions what had taken place at his first journey to Canaan, where in the 1st and 2d verses, the land is promised him, where he was to be made a great nation; and in this verso, it is said, that here the Lord had appeared unto him, and he had said, unto thy seed I will give this land, for this is connected with the pluperfect, or remote preter.

And there builded he an altar unto the Lord. The application of these words is decidedly wrong: Abram was not an idolater, therefore there was no necessity for the translators to say, that he built an altar to the Lord. The word *יהוה* *Jehovah*, rendered, the Lord, is not joined with *בית* *minbeech*, the altar; for at this last word the stop *katon*, finishes the division of the second proposition, and the following word *יהוה* *Jehovah*, with the *ב* *lamed* prefixed reads, before Jehovah. That is, in his first journey to Canaan in his younger days, he built there an altar, before Jehovah appeared unto him. So that he had built an altar for sacrifice in the plain of Moreh, a tabernacle where the Cherubim were placed for divine communication, as had been the custom from the beginning; then the Lord appeared, or communicated with him.

Here the object of the mission of Abram began to be unfolded. From the time of Canaan the son of Ham, who had revived the antediluvian idolatry, their posterity continued to worship the host of heaven, and were daily immersing themselves more and more in idolatry and cruelty. Abram therefore was sent to restore the true worship of God. We shall see that the expression *built an altar*, includes in it the establishment of every thing necessary for worship.

8. *And he removed.* Here again the pluperfect shews that he had removed, viz. after he had built the tabernacle at Shechem, from thence unto a mountain on the east of *בית אל* *Beth-el*, the house of God; plainly intimating that the erection of an altar, and of a house of God, or a tabernacle for public worship, mean the same. Some people have imagined that at this period, there were no places, no tabernacles for the public worship of God. Such persons would do well to consider, that a long time before Abram, the idolaters had their temples and altars, which we know were taken from the tabernacles and altars dedicated to

10 ¶ Moreover there was a famine in the land: therefore Abram went down to Egypt to sojourn there; because of the grievous famine, in the land.

11 Now it was, when he drew nigh, to enter Egypt: that he said to Sarai his wife; Behold now I know, thou art a woman fair to look on;

12 When it shall be that the Egyptians shall see thee, then they will say, This is his wife: and they will slay me, and with thee they will live.

the worship of God; such were the Chaldeans, the descendants of Ham, otherwise it would be to allow, that idolatry was the most ancient worship. It would be absurd indeed to suppose, that from the time of the establishment of the dispensation by Noah, to the time of Abram, a period of above five hundred years, there had been no tabernacles for the public worship of God; and that all the nations then worshipped God in the open air. These reasoners should recollect that Melchizedek, king and priest of Salem, or Jerusalem, must have had his tabernacle. This verse however shews that before the time of Abram, here was a *בית אל* *Beth-el*, a house of God, for so these words literally mean. At this mountain he again pitched his tabernacle, or place for the worship of God; and in the concluding clause it is said, where he had built an altar; the verb *בן* *yiben*, he had built, being the pluperfect tense. Where he proclaimed, that is, preached in the name of Jehovah.

10. How long Abram continued in Canaan before he was driven into Egypt by the famine, is not certain; he must have been there a considerable time; some years; for after he had built these two altars, or tabernacles at Shechem, and Hai, it is here said, that he journeyed going on still toward the south.

11. *A fair woman to look on.* Commentators having thus understood that Abram made but one journey thither in 100 years, and that he was 75 years old when he went, have been driven to the necessity of shewing that Sarai, who was but ten years younger than Abram, must have been a beautiful woman, at the advanced age of near 70 years; so as to have induced the courtiers to select her for the king of the country. It would only be a waste of time to repeat what commentators have proposed on this subject. The text does not refer to what passed after Abram was 75 years old, but to his previous journey, when in obedience to the command, ver. 1, he was passed through the land of Canaan; building places of worship, ver. 6, 7, 8, and had been driven thence by famine, to seek for sustenance in Egypt. At that period alluded to, Sarai was fair to look on; that is, she was a young woman; and the plain inference is, that his first journey was undertaken soon after his marriage. Indeed from the fact mentioned of the youth of Sarai, for the courtiers of a king would not have commended an old woman of seventy to the notice of their master, compared with the preceding narrative, we may conclude, that Terah left Ur to promote the cause to which Abram was called, but on account of his age, or from the difficulty of moving the whole household as often as the mission of Abram required, he was left at Haran. Abram however had obeyed—he had gone forth from the house of his father, and these occurrences in Canaan, and in Egypt, are connected with this first journey.

12. *They will slay me.* The fear expressed by Abram, must

13 Say now, thou art my sister; for it shall be well with me, because of thee; then my soul shall live by thy means.

14 Thus it was, as Abram came into Egypt, and the Egyptians had seen the woman, that she was very beautiful;

15 When the princes of Pharaoh had seen her, then they commended her to Pharaoh; and the woman was taken into the house of Pharaoh.

16 Therefore he treated Abram well, because of her: now he had sheep, and cattle, and asses; also men and maidens; and she-asses, and camels.

17 But JEHOVAH had plagued Pharaoh, with great plagues, also his house; because of the inatter of Sarai, wife of Abram.

18 Then Pharaoh called for Abram, and he said, Why hast thou done this to me? wherefore toldest thou not me? she is thy wife.

19 Wherefore saidst thou, She is my sister? thus I might have taken her to me, for a wife: therefore now behold thy wife, take her, and depart.

20 Then Pharaoh charged the men concerning him: and they sent him, with his wife, and all that he had.

CHAP. XIII.

THEN Abram departed from Egypt, with his wife, and all that he had, and Lot with him, to the south.

have been founded on his knowledge of the injustice and violence which prevailed at that time. From this, and the circumstances recorded in ch. xx. it appears that it was no uncommon thing for the great men to seize on any beautiful woman who might fall in their way; and if single, the relatives durst not complain, but if married, their husbands were in danger of being murdered.

15—20. In the east it was an ancient practice to place the women intended for the palace, in a house called the women's house, where they underwent certain purifications, which required some time to intervene, before they were conducted to the palace. In the interim the family of Pharaoh were plagued in such a manner, that the injury intended was suspected by Pharaoh to be the cause of the trouble which had come upon him and his house. And it is most likely that the character of Abram, as a teacher of the true worship of Jehovah, led them to this conclusion.

19. *Wherefore saidst thou, She is my sister?* See ch. xx.

NOTES ON CHAP. XIII.

1. *The south.* The southern part of Canaan, the famine having abated.

2. *Abram was very rich.* Yet some have supposed that he was a petty itinerant, a travelling drover.

3. Here the two Beth-els, or houses of God, mentioned

2 Moreover Abram was very rich, in cattle, in silver, and in gold.

3 Now he went on his journeys from the south, even to Beth-el; to the place, where his tabernacle had been from the beginning, between Beth-el, and Hai.

4 To the place of the altar, which he made there at the first; for there Abram preached, in the name of JEHOVAH.

5 Now Lot also, who went with Abram, had sheep, and oxen, and tents.

6 But the land could not support them, to remain together: for their substance was abundant; therefore they were not able to abide together.

7 Now there was strife between the shepherds of the cattle of Abram; and the shepherds of the cattle of Lot: and the Canaanite, and the Perizzite, then governed in the land.

8 But Abram had said to Lot, Be there no strife I pray thee, between me and thee; neither between my shepherds, nor thy shepherds: because of the men, our brethren.

9 Is not all the land before thy face? Depart I pray thee from before me: if towards the left, then I will take the right; but if towards the right, then I will go to the left.

10 Then Lot raised his eyes, for he had seen all the pasture of the Jordan, yea every where watered; before JEHOVAH destroyed Sodom and

above, are again introduced. And it does appear that one of them is referred to as a town. It was no uncommon thing for places in Canaan to be named after their deities, and temples; and it is very likely that the idolaters would call their temples *Beth-els*.

Where his tabernacle had been at the beginning. At his first journey, when he went into Canaan from Ur.

4. *The altar which he had made there at the first.* The historian is particular in order that it might be understood to be his first journey, as in addition to his *tabernacle*, which he had fixed there at the beginning, he now says that he had also built an altar there at his first journey.

7. From this translation we have been told by objectors, "that as the Canaanite and the Perizzite did not dwell in the land at the time of the inspired writer; therefore this book could not have been written until there were no Canaanites in the land: and that as there were Canaanites in the land at the time of Moses, that he could not be the writer of this book." But we know from the history that the Canaanites dwelt in the land from the time of Canaan, the immediate descendant of Noah, and that they dwelt there in the time of Moses. It would have been of little consequence for the writer to have informed us who dwelt in the land; no doubt, many different tribes dwelt in the land besides the Canaanite and the Perizzite. But it was of moment to say that at this period of the life of Abram,

Gomorrhah; like the garden of JEHOVAH, like the land of Egypt, in coming to Zoar.

11 So Lot chose for himself the whole pasture of the Jordan; and Lot removed from the east: thus they separated; each from before his brother.

12 Abram dwelt, in the land of Canaan; but Lot dwelt in the cities of the pasture; and he tabernacled before Sodom.

13 But the men of Sodom, *were* wicked; even exceedingly sinful; before JEHOVAH.

14 Then JEHOVAH said to Abram, after Lot had departed from him; Raise now thine eyes, and look from this place where thou art: north and south, also east and west.

15 For all the land which thou seest, I will give to thee, and to thy posterity, for ever.

16 And I will make thy posterity, as the dust of the earth: if man can number the dust of the earth; also thy posterity he shall number.

17 Arise, walk thyself over the land, to the length thereof, and to the breadth thereof: for to thee I will give it.

the Canaanite and the Perizzite governed the land; for agreeably to the idiom of the verb *וַיִּשְׁעֵב* *yasheeb*, this is the true meaning: viz. that these two tribes governed the land, but in the time of Moses it was divided into above thirty petty states.

9. Mark the condescension of the venerable patriarch, in allowing his nephew to make his election: he would have no strife.

10. Houbigant and others, have given rather glosses than translations of this verse. Many have complained of an obscurity in the common version, but certainly without reason; it is very good sense, and consistent with the original. There was certainly no necessity for the verb *was*, or the conjunction *even*, it reads better without them; and there is no authority for them in the Hebrew. *וַיִּשְׁעֵב* *kikar* is rendered *plain*, viz. the plain of Jordan, but it literally means a *pasture*, see Isa. xxx. 23; Psa. lxxv. 13, which word I prefer, it is in agreement with the occupation of Lot as a shepherd. The word *kar*, is used in various parts of England to mean a pasture, which in the wet season is frequently covered with water. This appears to have been the case as to the *kar*, or plain of Jordan, from the text: viz. that it was watered at the times of the overflowing of the Jordan.

13. The authorized translation of this verse is very objectionable. No doubt, the wicked are sinners. But from expressions of this kind in scripture, which have been noticed, the reader will readily understand this; they were *wicked*. There are various degrees of wickedness; persons may be wicked, and yet have a respect for the worship of God. But these idolaters, it appears, carried their hatred for the worship of God, as taught by Lot, to such a pitch, that it is said, they were *exceedingly sinful before Jehovah*. Not before Jehovah according to the common acceptance of the words, because in a general sense, all persons who are sinners, are so before him. By these words in a scriptural sense, is always meant, *before the face of Jehovah*: that is, they were sinners before the very altar of God. From which we may understand, that they interrupted the public

18 There Abram tabernacled, when he went and dwelt in the plains of Mamre, which is by Hebron: and he built there an altar, before JEHOVAH.

CHAP. XIV.

NOW it was in the days of Amraphael, king of Shinar, Arioch king of Ellasar, Chedorlaomer king of Elam; and Tidal king of nations.

2 They made war against Bera king of Sodom, also with Birsha, king of Gomorrhah, Shinab king of Admah, and Shemeber king of Zeboiim; and the king of Belah, which is Zoar.

3 All these combined, in the vale of Siddim, near the salt-sea.

4 Twelve years, they served, Chedorlaomer; but the thirteenth year, they rebelled.

5 Now in the fourteenth year came Chedorlaomer, and the kings who were for him; then they smote the Rephaims in Ashteroth Karnaim; likewise the Zuzims in Ham: also the Emims, in Shaveth Kiriathaim.

worship of God, by persecuting the worshippers when they assembled together.

14. *Jehovah said*. It is supposed by many, when they meet with such passages, that the communication was made by an angel, visible to the eye; but as Abram, was a prophet and exercised the office of priest in the tabernacle at Beth-el, or, house of God, he received the communication from between the Cherubim in the holy place, agreeably to the scripture: viz. *And there I will meet with thee, and I will commune with thee, from above the mercy-seat, from between the two Cherubim*, Exod. xxv. 22.

15. *To thy posterity for ever*. Objectors have said, "this is sufficient to convince any one, that the writer was not inspired, and that he did not receive his communications from God." But the word *עוֹלָם* *Gnolaam*, as is said, when applied to things of time, does not mean *for ever*; it then means to the final end of the thing spoken of, and which here signified the end of the dispensation to be fully manifested by Moses; its complete abrogation at the coming of Messiah.

18. *Abram tabernacled*. In the common version, *then Abram removed his tent*: but the verb, which is the third person singular preter, and which means, *he tabernacled*, or *settled*, is not connected with the pronoun *his*, nor with the substantive *tent*; no such words are in the original.

NOTES ON CHAP. XIV.

1. *It came to pass at that time, that Amraphel*. There can be no doubt who this king was. Onkelos appears to be right in making him to be one of the kings of Babylon; and that Chedorlaomer king of Elam, was a king of Persia, descended from Elam the son of Shem. Elam was certainly one of the most ancient kingdoms, named after Elam their progenitor. Elam is mentioned in the book of Daniel as the capital: viz. *Shushan which is in the province of Elam*.

5. *Ashteroth-Karnaim*. Were idols of the Philistines, said

6 And the Horites, in their mount of Seir, to El-paran, which is by the wilderness.

7 Then they returned, and came to En-mishpat, the same is Kadish; where they smote all the country of the Amalekites; yea also the Amorites, who dwelt in Hazezon-tamar.

8 Now the king of Sodom went forth with the king of Gomorrah, also the king of Admah, and the king of Zeboiim; and the king of Bela, which is Zoar: then they joined with them in battle; in the vale of Siddim.

9 Against Chedorlaomer king of Elam, and Tidal king of nations; also Amraphel king of Shinar, and Arioch king of Ellasar: four kings against five.

also to have been the abomination of the Zidonians. *Ashteroth* is a feminine noun plural; a compound word, from *Ashah* to make; and *roth* a tier, a circuit; like the Moon round the earth, and Venus round the sun. That the planets Venus and the Moon were understood by these words, appears sufficiently plain. *Karnaim*, means that which is horned, Deut. xxxiii. 17, and as none of the celestial bodies are horned, but the Moon, Venus, and Mercury; the Moon when she makes her first appearance after the conjunction with the sun; and the others when seen from the earth in a particular part of her orbit: it shews that these planets were worshipped by them, or held in high estimation, because they pointed out a particular season of the year in their kalendar. It also appears that they must have had the use of the telescope, as the planet Venus cannot be discovered to have the horned figure by the naked eye.

The Emims. See on Gen. xxxvi. 24.

Verse 13. *Abram the Hebrew.* Some commentators have supposed that Abram was so called, because he came from beyond the river Euphrates; and as the word *עברי* *Hebrew*, means to pass over, that he was called Abram the Hebrew, or he who passed over the river. But if this were so, all who passed over might have been so called; therefore this appears altogether improbable, as there might have been more persons of the name of Abram. But if we attend to the former part of the history, we shall find that the term Hebrew began with *עבר* *Eber*, who seems to have established the true worship of God agreeably to the ancient order, by the *pass-over sacrifice*, as typical of the coming of the true Messiah: see chap. x. 25. Therefore it is said of Peleg his son, *for in his days was the earth divided*. From which it appears, agreeably to the meaning of the word *עברי* *Hebrew*, that the descendants of Eber were called Hebrews, *pass-over men*, or those who obeyed the divine command by bringing their sacrificial offering, and who preached redemption by the great *passover offering*, the MESSIAH.

Confederate with Abram. This does not convey the literal sense of this clause: *בגלל ברית* *bagnali berith* means, that they were not only joined with Abram, but that they were worshippers of the God of Abram. For the word *berith* means, the *purifying sacrifice*, which God had established with Noah.

I have before observed, that some writers have thought Abram to have been a person of but little consequence in life, a kind of farmer, grazier, or itinerant. But we find from the transactions

10 Now the vale of Siddim had pits of mire; moreover the kings of Sodom and Gomorrah fled, then they fled there: but they that were left, fled to the mountain.

11 So they took all the riches of Sodom, and Gomorrah, even all their catables, and departed.

12 Also they took Lot, with his substance, the son of the brother of Abram, and they departed; for he was an inhabitant of Sodom.

13 But a fugitive came, and told it to Abram the Hebrew, where he resided in the plain of Mamre the Amorite, brother of Eshcol, and brother of Aner; for these were managers of the covenant of Abram.

14 When Abram heard that his brother was

recorded in this chapter, that he was a person of great consequence and dignity. He armed three hundred persons born in his own house. I believe few monarchs at this day can say so much. These appear to have been chief persons, or officers who lived with him; no mean number to provide for every day. We also are in possession of historical records which confirm this (as was said). Josephus, Antiq. c. viii. quotes the statement of Berops the Chaldean historian. And in Justin. lib. xxvi. c. ii. we have the testimony of Troguus Pompeius, who says, "the Jews derive their origin from Damascus, a famous city of Syria; their kings were Abraham and Israel." See also Clemens Alexandrinus, Strom. v. and Eusebius, lib. xiii. c. xii. Which is perfectly consistent with scripture authority, where it is said, he was a mighty prince, ch. xxi. 6. And even the sons of Ishmael were twelve princes according to their nations, xiv. 16. Mamre was the prince or governor of that part of the country where Abram resided, as it is said, *Mamre the Amorite*; who, with his two brothers, Eshcol and Aner, were in league with Abram. What number of men these three chiefs of the country brought into the field to join Abram, is not mentioned; but we may reasonably conclude it was no mean number, as Abram armed three hundred and eighteen, born in his own house. We find also that the command was given to Abram, who on account of the people being converted to the worship of God by his ministry, had, no doubt, obtained great confidence among them.

Verse 14. Both ancient and modern objectors have brought, what they have thought an insurmountable objection, against the genuineness of the book of Genesis from this verse. It is here said that, *Abraham pursued the captors unto Dan*; but in the 18th of Judges, verse 29, when the Danites took Laish, it is said, they called the name of the city Dan, after the name of Dan their father, which was not until 330 years after the death of Moses. "Therefore (say they) it was impossible that this book could be written in the time of Moses, because there was no such place as Dan."

There is no ground for supposing that the Dan mentioned in Genesis, was the same Dan spoken of in Judges; it is not said that the Dan in Genesis was a town, but expressly *in kar*, a pasture; whereas it is said in Judges, that they changed the name of the town of Laish to that of Dan. Now as this Dan in Genesis was by these objectors introduced in the early ages of the Christian church as a town, it certainly was their business to

a captive, then he armed his train, born in his house, three hundred and eighteen; and he pursued them to Dan.

15 Now he had divided against them by night, he and his servants, there he smote them: then he pursued them to Hobah, which is on the left, of Damascus.

16 So he returned with all the substance, even also with Lot his brother, and his substance he brought back; yea also the women, and the people.

17 Now the king of Sodom went forth, to meet him, after his return from the smiting of

Chedorlaomer, and the kings who were with him, at the valley of Shaveh; the same is the valley of the king.

18 Then Melchizedek, king of Salem, brought forth bread and wine: now he was a priest, of God most high.

19 There he blessed him, and said: Blessed be Abram before God most high; possessor of heaven and earth.

20 Yea blessed be God most high, who hath delivered thine enemies into thy hand: and he gave to him the tenth of all.

21 Then said the king of Sodom to Abram.

have proved that it was a town. It is no uncommon thing for a town and a river to be called by the same name; as Arnon, and the river Arnon, Jer. xlviii. 20. Gozan, and the river Gozan, 2 Kings xix. 12. So in modern times, Wye, and the river Wye; Tame, and the river Tame. The river Shef, and Shef, which afterwards was a village called Shef-field. But unless it could be proved that the Dan in Genesis was a town, there is no authority for concluding that the Dan in Genesis was the same as the Dan in Judges.

Neither is it likely, as some have asserted, that the river Jordan derived its name from two smaller rivers called *Jor* and *Dan*, whose streams uniting in one, were then called Jordan, because the river Jordan has only one spring-head rising near the foot of mount Lebanon. I will now give what will be allowed as sufficient proof for asserting, that the Dan in Genesis was no other than the river Jordan, by shewing whence it had its name.

The word *Jordan*, is a compound word, formed by the words *Jor* and *Dan*. *Jor* means to *cast down*; it is applied to the casting down, or overcoming of an army, Exod. xv. 4; 1 Sam. xx. 36; Numb. xxi. 30. It is also applied to mean a river, because it descends with rapidity, sweeping every thing before it. Now it was always the custom with the ancient Hebrews, to give names to things significant, either on account of their locality, or of some particular circumstance which had taken place in their favour, as *BEER-SHEBA*, *the well of the oath*; *ESKOL*, *the river of grapes*, *Eshkol* meaning grapes; *BESOR*, *tidings*, or the river of tidings; *KIDRON*, *mourning*, or the river of mourning; *KISHON*, *strength*, the river of strength; *DAN*, *judgment*, the river of judgment. Thus Abraham pursued the captors who had taken Lot from Sodom, to this pasture, or plain of his, bounded by the river; defeated them, and executed a just judgment upon them, which is meant by *pursuing them unto Dan, or judgment*. It being therefore a custom with the Hebrews, on what they considered to be a signal interposition of Providence, to give names expressive of the transaction or thing, the word *DAN*, *judgment*, or to *judge*, was with great propriety affixed to the word *Jor*, which makes *Jordan* the river of judgment. But perhaps objectors may say, that the river Jordan could not have derived its name from the memorable victory which Abram obtained over the armies of those four kings, because Jordan is mentioned in the former part of the chapter. This however would be of no weight, for the time was short between Lot's setting in Sodom and his being taken prisoner; and Moses, who wrote the book of Genesis, lived 400 years after Abram. From which it is evident that there is no ground for this objection, notwithstanding it appears so strik-

ingly conclusive in the form that objectors have laid it before the public.

18. *Melchizedek king of Salem*. Many comments have been written in all ages respecting this person. Commentators have generally supposed, from what is said in the Epistle of Paul, as it stands in the English translation, that this Melchizedek was Christ, and that there never was such a person, a king of Salem. But this is an error, and if admitted, would make the particulars of Abram's rescuing Lot, and his returning from the battle of the kings, when Melchizedek met him, altogether visionary.

The original however is express; it says, *he was king of Salem, and a priest of God most high*. That is, he was a priest of that order, which had been from the beginning established at Salem, the ancient name of Jeru-salem. For there was an order of priesthood established among the heathen worshippers: those nations famous for idolatry, the Amalekites, Amorites Chaldeans, &c. being then powerful nations.

The passage in the Epistle, Heb. vii. 1, 3, reads in the translation thus. *Melchizedek, king of Salem, priest of the most high God, who met Abraham returning from the slaughter of the kings, and blessed him.—Without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life; but made like unto the Son of God; abideth a priest continually*. But in the original *απατος, μητρως, αγενεαλογητος*, *no father, no mother, no genealogy*; that is, "no descent from any sacerdotal family, as the Levitical priests had. For *αγενεαλογητος* *agenealogetos*, cannot refer to Melchizedek having no natural genealogy, or natural father or mother; because his being without genealogy from any sacerdotal family, is mentioned as one instance of his resemblance to Christ; whose genealogy is particularly traced both by Matthew and Luke, who was not descended from any sacerdotal line, but sprung from Judah, of which tribe Moses said nothing concerning the priesthood." This is plain from the following verses of the same chapter; *Now consider how great this man was, unto whom even the patriarch Abraham gave the tenth of the spoils. And verily they that are of the sons of Levi, who receive the office of the priesthood, have a commandment to take tithes of the people, according to the law; but he (Melchizedek) whose descent is not counted from them (i.e. the sons of Levi) received tithes of Abraham, and blessed him*.

This is rendered very clear in the Syriac version, which is one of the most ancient, and was in use when Peter was at Antioch; viz. *whose father and mother were not written in their genealogies*, viz. in the genealogies of the priests in the time of Moses; for all the families of the Jews were written in their genealogies,

Give to me the persons; and take the substance for thyself.

22 But Abram said to the king of Sodom: I have lifted my hand before JEHOVAH, God most high; possessor of Heaven and Earth;

23 Except of a cord, when for a latchet of a shoe; I surely will not accept of any thing that is thine: for thou shalt not say, I have enriched Abram.

24 Save only what the youths have eaten, and the portion of the men, who went with me: Aner, Eschcol, and Mamre; they shall take their portion.

CHAP. XV.

AFTER these transactions, the word of JEHOVAH came to Abram in a vision, saying: Thou shalt not fear Abram, I am a shield to thee; thy exceeding great reward.

which were kept in the temple. But as this method of registering the people by their tribes and families, only had its formal beginning under Moses, there could be no account given of the genealogy of Melchizedek, who lived 600 years before the priesthood of Aaron.

That there was a priesthood established for the worship of the most high God, consequently a dispensation prior to that given to the Israelites, is evident from various parts of scripture. We read that when the Hebrews came out of Egypt, before the establishment of the priesthood of Aaron, Jethro, the father-in-law of Moses, was a prince, and a priest of Midian, and offered sacrifices at which Moses and Aaron attended; which proves that he was a priest of the most high God as well as Melchizedek. So it is recorded that Job, the king of Idumea, who lived at the time of Moses, exercised the priestly office, ch. i. 5, and of course was a priest after the order of Melchizedek. Which priesthood differed from the levitical, being chosen only from the firstborn.

NOTES ON CHAP. XV.

1. *The word of Jehovah.* The Hebrew says, *the word of Jehovah was to Abram.* These words frequently occur in the sacred writings, and I shall very often have to remind the reader, that by this phrase we are not to understand such communication was given in any other way, than in that which God ordained: viz. agreeably to the order of the dispensation which he gave from the beginning. Therefore when such passages are met with, we must recollect, that the officiating priest was then in the more immediate presence of God, in the holy place, where he spake from between the Cherubim.

In a vision. The word *vision* *hamachazeh*, does not mean a vision, according to the vulgar acceptance of the word. It means to contemplate with affection or delight, in which state the mind was prepared; waiting to receive this extraordinary communication.

2. *The steward of my house is this Eliezer of Damascus.* This is not intelligible; the childless state of Abram, and the steward of his house, are two grievances which Abram complained of. But surely if the first were a grief to him, the reader of the common version would say, it was in his power to

2 Then Abram said, LORD JEHOVAH, what wilt thou give to me? for I am without offspring: even the steward is the son of my house; this Eliezer of Damascus.

3 Thus Abram said, Behold, to me, thou hast not given posterity: and lo a son of my house, shall inherit after me.

4 Then behold JEHOVAH spake to him saying; This same shall not be thine heir: for certainly he who shall come forth from thyself; he shall be thine heir.

5 Then he brought him forth abroad, and he said, Look now toward heaven, and number the stars; if thou be able to number them: then he said to him, Thus shall be thy posterity.

6 And he believed in JEHOVAH: therefore he counted it to him, righteousness.

remedy the second, by discharging the steward. The word *two meshech*, is properly translated by, *steward*; but the word *ben*, i. e. a son, is omitted, which makes a consistent sense, viz. *For the steward of my house is the son, this Eliezer of Damascus.* Agreeably to the custom of that age, the person who was the firstborn in the house, was invested with the management of all the estate and property in the houses of great men; and if the possessor died childless, the son of the house, the firstborn, or steward, became the heir.

4. This is not a second communication in answer to the complaint of Abram, which he makes in the 2d and 3d verses; not a repetition connected with the subject in the 1st verse. But the historian says, God had, at a former period, informed Abram, that he should have posterity; and therefore this, and the following verse in the original, are written in the pluperfect, or remote preter tense; viz. *For behold Jehovah had spoken*, and in the next verse, *yea he had brought Abram forth abroad.* This is a reference to the time when Abram separated from Lot in the xiith chapter, where in the 10th verse he is told, *that his posterity should be as the dust of the earth for multitude.* By this error in the authorized version, in not giving the proper modification of the tense of the verb, a weighty objection has been made, viz. that, "if this were a communication from God, the historian could not have introduced the same words in the first and fourth verses; that it appears to be the same communication; there is no intermediate time given to introduce a second." But when the verses are translated agreeably to the original, in the pluperfect, or remote preter time, this objection vanishes.

5. From the common version it appears that at this time, Abram was shown all these things. But here the historian refers to a former period, many years before he received this communication. In the common version, the same, or a similar promise, is made to be repeated. But the sacred writer in this verse refers to this promise in the thirteenth chapter, ver. 14-16, where Abram was told by the divine communication from the Cherubim, *to lift up his eyes—northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward, i. e. to the heaven, and that, if a man could count the dust of the earth, so should his posterity be numbered.* Accordingly we find here, that the verb is in the pluperfect tense.

7 Then he said to him: I am JEHOVAH, who brought thee forth from Ur of the Chaldees, to give to thee even this land, to possess it.

8 But he said; LORD JEHOVAH, by what shall I know, that I shall possess it?

9 And he said to him, Bring before me a calf of three years, with a she goat of three years, and a ram of three years: also a turtle dove, and a pigeon.

7. Here it is recorded, that no communication was given but in the appointed way, by sacrifice, and by obedience to the commands. Abram was commanded to take *חֵזֶן gneglah, an heifer*—*וְעִזּוֹ ve gneez, and a goat*, *וְאַיִל ve ayil, and a ram*, *וְתוֹר ve thor, and a turtle-dove*, *וְגִזְזָאֵל ve gazaal, and a young pigeon*. This shews that the dispensation renewed to Abram, was complete, as to the creatures which were to be offered in sacrifice; for all the creatures were here offered to God, which were offered by Noah, and which we find afterwards mentioned under the fullness of the dispensation, when Moses led the people out of Egypt. So that the dispensation from the beginning was the same.

11. And when the fowls came down upon the carcasses. This passage exhibits a grand and dignified detail of circumstances attending a special communication under the ancient dispensation. Abram was commanded to prepare a sacrifice, which embraced the whole assemblage of the creatures offered under the Mosaic dispensation, which indeed was only a display, or a more general promulgation of this communication to Abram. Now the reader must keep in mind the order of the sacrifices; they were always offered at the altar, in the tabernacle, in the presence of the great congregation. On the present occasion, the assistants prepared the sacrifices; for we must not imagine that Abram, whose business it was to offer them at the altar, and to receive the divine commands in the holy place, prepared the offerings himself. A little consideration will convince the reader, that a heifer, a goat, a ram, a turtle dove, and a pigeon, could not be prepared by the officiating priest; but, as afterwards under the levitical priesthood, by proper persons appointed to prepare the sacrifices.

And when the fowls came down upon the carcasses, Abram drove them away. Several important mistakes have been made in the translation of this passage. Abram had now been many years in the land of Canaan; he had during a long period, preached in the name of Jehovah, had erected altars and tabernacles throughout the land, and, consequently, must have been the instrument in converting many of the people to the true worship. At this time he dwelt in the plain of Mamre, where he had erected a tabernacle, in which he offered this sacrifice; so that it was not possible that the fowls could come into the tabernacle to devour the sacrifices. It is as certain that Abram was not employed in driving them away; because the deep sleep, which is said to have fallen on him, puts this out of the question; as that same sleep must have rendered it impossible for him to have protected the carcasses. But it has been said, that this deep sleep took place after he had driven the birds away. Admitted; but the same vigilance would have been necessary afterwards, for if he had not continued to have watched the carcasses, the same thing would have occurred. Therefore it will appear that this cannot be the meaning of the sacred writer.

It must also be remembered, that as no communication was

10 So he brought before him all these, and he divided them in the midst; then he laid each his piece against his other: but the bird, he divided not.

11 Then descended the covering upon the bodies, with them he inspired Abram.

12 Now it was before the departure of the sun, that an inactive state overwhelmed Abram: and beheld a horrible great darkness fell before him.

given but in the Holy of Holies, within the veil; and never but when the sacrifice was on the altar, which was in the first part of the *שַׁרְתִּי Mishkan, or Holy-place*; i. e. the first division before the inner apartment beyond the veil, called the Holy of Holies: it was not possible for Abram to drive the fowls away, had this been the case, because he was not at the altar when God communicated with him. For when God descended in the cover of the incense, then the priest entered within the veil to receive the communication. In short, to view it in the light in which it is represented in the common version, is neither consistent with the command of God respecting sacrifice, nor with the practice of the church down to his time.

Besides, it leaves us to suppose that, at this period, the patriarch had not offered sacrifices at the altar; but we are left to conclude that he now offered in the open air; and yet this ignorance of the order of sacrificial worship is contradicted, because we find that he had from the beginning of his ministry offered sacrifices in the tabernacles at the altar, ch. xii. 8;—xiii. 18, throughout the land.

וַיִּכְסֶה He gnyit, is translated, *the fowls*; it is not plural, it is a noun, from the verb *to cover*. It may be proper to shew, as the translators have rendered this word in a few places to mean *ravenous birds*, that they have been mistaken; for by referring to those places where this word occurs, we shall find, that the true translation will read consistently with reason, and the probability of the thing; consequently, with the intention of the sacred writer.

Isaiah xli. 11. *Calling for the ravenous bird from the east* This word comes from the radix *מָנָה gnatah*, as a verb, *to cover* to be covered, or *protected*; or *cover the spoil*, 1 Sam. xv. 14;—xiv. 32; also as a noun, *a garment, a covering*, Lev. xiii. 43 *a covering*; Jer. xlii. 12, *to put on a covering*; Isa. lxi. 3, *the garment*. In this verse of Isaiah, it is used to mean, the coming forth of a mighty power from the east, *the man to execute his counsel*; for *מְנַחֵם minizrah*, with which it is connected, means *to spring forth*; applied to the east, whence the light springs forth, or *life*. Also to the *Glory of God*, which springeth forth to the upright in heart, and life, Psa. cxli. 4; to the divine light, Isa. lx. 1; Deut. xxxiii. 2. And if this verse be read in connection with the preceding verses, it will be plain that the translators have greatly erred in translating this word by, *ravenous bird*. The prophet was speaking against their idolatry, ver. 6, 7; he then reminded them that the true God was no other than he who declared the end from the beginning, and from ancient times, whose counsel shall stand, and who will do all his pleasure. And in the next verse, the 11th, he does not say, as in the common version, *calling a ravenous bird from the east*; where *מְנַחֵם gnyit*, which is only one word, is made two, viz. *a ravenous bird*: but, *calling a covering*, (i. e. an invader) *from the east*; from a land remote, a man his counsellor. The word *covering* being used to signify the invasion of

13 And he said to Abram, Understanding thou shalt know, that thy posterity shall be a sojourner,

the numerous armies with which the nation was always threatened, when the people departed from the worship of God: emphatically called, *the man of his counsel*. Thus by the accomplishment of the prophecy, they were instructed, and by this *counsellor*, this executor of the judgment of God, they were induced to forsake idolatry.

Job xxviii. 7. *There is a path which no fowl knoweth.* Here the word *way grayit*, is rendered by *fowl*, but as above, it means that which *covereth*. Job was speaking of the mighty power of God: he says in the preceding chapter, *I will teach you by the hand* (i. e. power) *of God, that which is with the Almighty will I not conceal*: viz. those things which are in the power of God only. The same he continues in this chapter; and in the 2d verse, he says, *He setteth an end to darkness*; viz. when he causeth the morning to spring forth; and in this 7th verse, where *way grayit*, a cover, occurs; he says, *The path-cover knoweth he not, though the vulture-eye hath not seen it*, viz. the path of the wicked, who craftily conceal their practices from the observation of those whose keen penetration is compared to the eye of the vulture: yet God seeth them. But to say, as in the common version, *There is a path which no fowl knoweth, and which the vulture's eye hath not seen*, is what would not be admitted as correct language, by any correct writer or speaker. For if no fowl knoweth the path, and as the vulture is included in the general term *fowl*, it necessarily follows, agreeably to the first clause, viz. *which no fowl knoweth*, that the vulture is included in the first clause. And yet there are those who tell us, that the common translation is a good one.

Again Jer. xii. 9, *Mine heritage is unto me as a speckled bird; the birds round about are against her.* The learned Bochart was at a loss to know, how the heritage of God could be compared to a *speckled bird*; and well he might. He thinks that *חַגְנַיִט tsabunag*, should be rendered a *ferce hyena*; but is this comparison less exceptionable than the one he condemns? In this one passage only, in all the scripture, is the word *חַגְנַיִט tsabunag*, rendered by *speckled*; it means literally a *colour*. See Jud. v. 30, to *Sisera a prey of divers colours*. The prophet Jeremiah was, in the preceding verse, charging the people with idolatry, where he says, *Mine heritage is unto me as a lion in the forest, that crieth out against me, therefore have I hated it.* Meaning by this comparison, as a lion covereth himself in the forest, so his heritage covered themselves in their idolatry, in their groves, where they celebrated their worship. He then proceeds in this verse to convince them that their affection of external grandeur, by which their priests deceived the people, was displeasing to God, viz. *mine heritage with a coloured covering before me, with a covering continually upon her.* This refers to that state of the people, when they had embraced idolatry; see former chapter, ver. 17, when they appeared in the tabernacle, in all the pomp and grandeur with which the idolatrous nations celebrated their worship.

The last place where this word occurs, is in Ezek. xxxix. 4, *the RAVENOUS BIRD of every sort.* Here we shall find that the same rendering is obvious as above; this is plain from the connexion of *חַגְנַיִט tsaphor*, i. e. *bird*, with *חַגְנַיִט legneet*; for had *legneet* meant literally a *ravenous bird*, there then had been no necessity for the sacred writer to have joined with it the word *חַגְנַיִט tsaphor*, which is the common term for birds: the passage reads, *to the cover-bird of every wing.* The sacred writer compares the enemies of Israel to birds, which in those countries

in a land that is not theirs; and shall serve them, and they shall afflict them, four hundred years.

fly in great multitudes, so as to cover the ground where they alight, and in a short time destroy whole crops. For we read that they frequently came *swift as the eagle flieeth*, covering the land, and like these birds destroying all before them.

This word cannot be applied to mean the different species of birds, because it is applied to beasts, Jer. xii. 9, above. It is, as I have observed, a noun from the radix *חַגַּן* *gnatah*, a cover, a covering, a garment, because it covers; and thus it becomes a general word for what covers. But it does not mean any species of birds; it is no more applicable to *birds*, than it is to *beasts*, or *insects*, and no more applicable to them than it is to invading armies, which cover the land and destroy the produce. So that the error has been evidently made by applying the word to mean birds, instead of applying it to mean a *cover*, when either birds, beasts, insects, or invaders covered the land. Which, as above, is confirmed in Ezek. xxxix. 4, where *חַגְנַיִט legneet tsaphor*, rendered in the common version, *ravenous birds*, in construction, can have no such translation.

Because the word *חַגְנַיִט ha grayit*, comes from *חַגַּן* *gnatah*, to cover, fly, rush, the translators have applied it to ravenous birds and beasts, Jer. xii. 9. But it is the same with all birds when pinched with hunger; they fly, or rush impetuously on their food: so that it may with equal propriety be applied to those which are not ravenous. Aquila renders the word *חַגְנַיִט va-yugnit*, sh. xxiv. 14, by *ὑπερβη*, and he was impelled: and the Septuagint on 1 Sam. xv. 19, render *חַגְנַיִט valagnat*, by *ὑπερβη* *ormeeas*, thou didst rush. This being the true radical meaning of the word *חַגְנַיִט hagnayit*, the application is obvious, as it is wholly applied by the sacred writer to the descent of the divine glory, as soon as the incense was offered, and the cloud of it, which is called the cloud of Jehovah, Exod. xl. 36, covered the mercy-seat, Lev. xvi. 13; then it was *חַגְנַיִט va yeered*, that the cover, the divine glory, descended, rushing, in the incense, or covering the sacrifice, while the patriarch was offering, as he was commanded; and as it is also said, *I will appear in the cloud that is upon the mercy-seat*, Lev. xvi. 2.

Now as the incomprehensible Jehovah was not seen by Moses, (for it is said he only heard a voice speaking to him from off the mercy-seat, Numb. vii. 89,) it is in perfect conformity with the meaning of this word, and with similar manifestations recorded, to conclude, that the prophets of God were made sensible of the approach of the divine influence in the cloud of the incense. This was the case at the opening of the temple; 1 Kings viii. 10, 11, *And it came to pass, when the priests were come out of the holy place, (viz. where they had been offering the incense,) that the cloud filled the house of the Lord; for the glory of the Lord had filled the house of the Lord.* This is also in agreement with the divine communication, which was given at the feast of Pentecost, recorded Acts ii. 2, *And suddenly there came a sound from heaven, as of a rushing mighty wind.*

Another error has been committed, and that the most important in the whole verse. The word *חַגְנַיִט yeered*, is translated, *came down*; but in no part of scripture can this word be so rendered; it is one word in the original, therefore cannot be translated as a compound word. Neither is it the third person plural preter, as in the common version, but the third person singular preter of the verb to descend; and so I have rendered it, agreeably to its grammatical construction in every other part of scripture. So that *yeered*, he descended, a verb singular, is not only translated as a plural, viz. *the fowls descended*, but it is applied to the descent of fowls, instead of being applied to the

14 Then also that nation whom they shall serve, I will judge: and afterward straightway they shall come forth, with great substance.

descent of the smoke of the incense, which was the cover of the divine glory: and which from the holy place descended and covered the bodies. We now return to the verse under consideration: יָשֹׁבֵב *Yasheeb*, is translated *drove away*; but it is one word, and therefore cannot be rendered as a compound. This word is not from the root יָשָׁב *yashab*, to remain, sit; which has been supposed by some lexicon writers, because the Septuagint have rendered יָשֹׁבֵב *yasheeb otham*, by *compulsi sunt*; he sat by them. It is from יָשָׁב *yashab*: words from this root are only found in this and in two other places in the Bible. It means to be breathed into, blown into, to blow, and thus to inspire; it is used in this sense Isaiah xl. 7, *The spirit of the Lord bloweth*. This is an allusion to the Spirit of God, inspiring, or being poured forth, at the coming of the Messiah. See ver. 1 to 7; Psa. cxlvii. 18, *He causeth his wind to blow*. The word יָשֹׁבֵב *yasheeb* is the third person singular preter of the verb to inspire: viz. he inspired. Which refers to the person of the verb יָרַד *yeered*, he descended, in the first clause; that is, God descended by the divine glory, in the cover of the smoke of the incense, and inspired Abram. The effect of this awful manifestation on Abram, appears in the next verse, *A horror of great darkness fell upon him*. This also agrees with the Apostle, John xx. 22, *He breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost*. This last clause reads, *With them he inspired Abram*. The word יָשָׁב *yashab*, from this root, is translated in the Latin version of Sebastiani Schmidii, by *spiravit*. See Buxtorf, Taylor, &c. where this word is rightly placed under יָשֹׁבֵב, while others following the Septuagint, have erroneously placed it under יָשָׁב *yashab*. This shews, as I have frequently observed, that the compiler of the modern Greek version, called the *Septuagint*, in the second century, did not critically understand the Hebrew, or he would have known, that in defective verbs, the first radical is omitted, and instead thereof, the second radical has a dagesh.

Thus we find that this sacrifice was offered at the altar, in the tabernacle; and as the communications were always given in the way which God had appointed from the beginning, viz. from above the Cherubim in the holy-place, Abram did not drive away any fowls, or ravenous birds; but instead of this thing recorded in the common version, which was altogether impossible, the sacred writer gives us a grand idea of the interposition of God, who by the cover of the cloud of incense, descended in the way which he ordained, and covered the sacrifice. As it is written Lev. xvi. 2, *I will appear in the cloud (of incense) upon the mercy-seat*; ver. 13, *And he shall put the incense upon the fire before the Lord, that the cloud of the incense may cover the mercy-seat that is upon the testimony*. The passage then reads literally, agreeably to the Hebrew syntax, thus, *Then the covering descended upon the carcasses; with them he inspired Abraham*; even as it is said, Lev. ix. 24, *Fire went forth from before the presence of Jehovah, and consumed the offering on the altar*. See *Intro. p. xx*.

This special communication to Abram is, perhaps, the most important one recorded in scripture, as it comprehends the whole of the sacrificial worship exhibited by one person, at one time, by one Melchizedekian priest, or by a priest who was of the order of Melchizedek. From the solemnity which accompanies the whole narrative, and from the practice of the church which had received the divine communication from above the Cherubim from the beginning, it appears that Abram offered

15 But thou shalt go to thy fathers, in peace: thou shalt be buried, in old age, prosperous.

16 With the fourth generation, they shall

this sacrifice before the great congregation in the tabernacle. For before his time we find that tabernacles had been built, which were called בֵּתֵי אֱלֹהִים *beth-els*, the houses of God; where, agreeably to the established order, he communicated with man from the mercy-seat. See ch. xii. 9.

It is impossible to take a view of this subject without seeing how perfectly it represents the person, office, and character of the Messiah; in whom, and by whom, all sacrificial worship, which was representative of him, was to cease for ever, when he had once for all opened a way into the Holy of Holies; who like Abram was to be a priest after the order of Melchizedek, a king and a priest; but who was to be a priest for ever, and whose kingdom was to be eternal.

12. *A deep sleep*. See on ch. xi. 21, where it appears that the word *tardeemah*, does not mean a deep sleep, but a state of inactivity, or to be reduced to a state of uncertainty.

A horror of great darkness. The word מַחֲשֵׁי עֵינַי *syamah*, is rendered by *horror*; but it is also used to mean *idols*, and *idol worship*; and thus it was descriptive of that darkness of mind which was consequent on idol worship; Jer. l. 38, *upon idols*, and in Job xx. 23. It is connected with the *idolaters* when they worshipped in their tabernacle. In the common version מַחֲשֵׁי עֵינַי *gualan emim*, is rendered, *terrors are upon him*, but there was no necessity to transpose the word *emim*; it reads *before him are idols*. It then follows in the next verse, the 26th, *All darkness hid in their secret places*; viz. in the places where the idolaters deposited their idols, in imitation of the ark and Cherubim in the holy place. This verse in Job then concludes, denouncing the effect of idol worship, *It shall go ill with them that are left in his tabernacle*, viz. in the tabernacle of the idol.

If then the industrious and learned Bochart, who was well acquainted with all the Hebrew learning of modern Jews, was at a loss to know what to make of the passage, Jer. xii. 9. where this word occurs, it will appear that nothing satisfactory respecting the true meaning and application of the word in the verse before us, has been laid before the public since the time of Jerome, in the fourth century. Indeed it would be unreasonable for Christians to expect to receive any information from Jews respecting the true nature of the sacrifices, and their application to the Messiah. Who, notwithstanding they have now seen, for near 2000 years, all the prophecies before and after the captivity accomplished in the person of the true Messiah—the destruction of the second temple, during which the Messiah was to come, according to the express declaration of Haggai, ii. 7—who, according to the prophet Micah, v. 2, was to come from Bethlehem—also the abolition of ceremonies and sacrifices, which the apostle declares he abolished at the cross, Col. ii. 14, where they have been nailed for near 2000 years—no sacrifices are offered by them in any part of the world, nor have they any desire to offer them.—Yet they remain with an empty profession, which cannot be Judaism, with all these facts before them, as declared by the prophets, by the apostles, and by the Messiah, who told them himself—*And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled*. Luke xxi. 24. This incontrovertible fact is now accomplishing, as it has been for near 2000 years—the Hebrews have fallen by the sword—they have been led away captive into all nations—and Jerusalem has

return hither: for the iniquity of the Amorites, is not yet finished.

17 Now it was when the sun had departed, and it was twilight: then behold a shining smoke, and a torch of fire, when he passed between the divisions of these.

been trodden down of the Gentiles, from the dispersion. Jerusalem was taken by the Romans under Vespasian, and destroyed—the country was afterwards subject to the Saracens; it was then taken by Selim the first Emperor of the Turks, who have retained the dominion to this day. The fact confirming the truth of this prophecy, I say, is now before the face of the whole world—"facts are stubborn things"—both Jew and Infidel, reasoning on this wonderful accomplishment, must be convinced that the Divine speaker had his word from the fountain of truth. This once hallowed land, sacred for its being the place where the word of God was given; a land revered both by the Jew and the Christian: by the Jew, because it was the place where God had chosen to put his name there; the hallowed place, where the SHECHINAH, the sacred dwelling, was made **FEARFULLY HOLY**, by the manifestation of the **GLORY OF GOD**; the place to which the *sacred law-giver* brought the people out of captivity: by the Christian, because the Redeemer, the *sacred law-abolisher*, from that place promulgated his sacred truths, abolished all representative worship, and gave the gospel to all nations. This **HOLY LAND** has now been figuratively sown with *brimstone and salt* for eighteen hundred years. O that it could be blotted from the remembrance of posterity! While Christian princes have been fighting against each other, this **SACRED LAND** has been burning with *brimstone and salt*, in the hands of barbarous infidels; infidels who have been afflicting and insulting all Christian nations for ages; and who have kept their sons and daughters in slavery; till, by the magnanimity of one Christian Prince, which shall be recorded to the eternal honour of England, it is **ABOLISHED FOR EVER**. Surely the time is at hand for the banishment of the infidel race to the land from whence they came; or for the total abolition of Mahometan abomination on the consecrated land of Canaan. When the Gospel shall be planted in Egypt, and when the people shall hear, and fear, and obey the commandments of God; when the Redeemer shall plant the Gospel Shechinah in the goodly land, and the Temples of the Holy One of Jacob shall again be established on the tops of the mountains.

18. An objection has often been made to this part of scripture, because instead of 400, it appears that they were only 215 years in Egypt. It is not strange that this has been objected to, when commentators have disagreed, and have given different statements respecting it; but the original is plain. The word *ger*, means a *sojourner*, a person, or people of a different family; not a native. Thus they were sojourners in Canaan 215 years, before they went into Egypt; for if we add the whole of the years of Koath, Amram, and Moses, it will shew, that they could not have been in Egypt 400 years. Koath the son of Levi, then a youth, went with his father into Egypt, and died at the age of 139 years: his son Amram, the father of Moses, lived 137 years; and Moses was 80 years old when he led them out of Egypt. These added together make only 350 years. From this number we must take the age of Koath when he went into Egypt; the years that Amram lived with his father Koath; and the years of Moses at the death of

18 In that day, JEHOVAH made for Abram a covenant, saying: To thy posterity, I have given this land; from the river of Egypt, to the great river, the river Euphrates.

19 The Kenites, and the Kenizzites, and the Kadmonites.

Amram: which would reduce the number 350 to 215 years, the time that they sojourned in Egypt. The first 215 years are thus to be ascertained, from the 75th year of Abram to their going into Egypt; 25 years from the promise to the birth of Isaac, 60 years to the birth of Jacob, Gen. xxv. 26, who was 130 years old when he stood before Pharaoh, ch. xlvii. 9.

17. *A smoking furnace, and a burning lamp.* This translation gives us no information; we can have no conception of the meaning or application of a *smoking furnace, and a burning lamp*, passing between the pieces of the sacrifice.

The reader will remember, that Abram was here directed to offer the sacrifices on the altar; all the creatures were commanded to be brought, which constituted the sacrificial worship under this dispensation; which was to be promulgated on the fourth generation from the sojourning of the children of Israel with Jacob, and which reached to their deliverance from Egypt. The preparation of the sacrifices is also given, and the disposal of them on the altar. And agreeably to the established order, God then communicated with him from above the Cherubim. The reader will also remember another important matter. When the sacrifice was offered, the priests were commanded to *put the incense upon the fire before the Lord, that the cloud (or smoke) of the incense might cover the mercy-seat.* Lev. xvi. 13. And there it was that God would appear in the cloud upon the mercy-seat, ver. 2. This being attended to, we shall naturally be led to the true meaning and application of the passage under consideration; but first it is necessary to obtain the literal meaning of the original.

The words *thanur gnaashaan*, are rendered, a *smoking furnace*; *thanur* from the root *nor* *near*, signifies that which gives *light*, used representatively to mean the spiritual light, 2 Sam. xxi. 7. *light of Israel*; Job xxix. 3, *his light*; Psa. xviii. 28, cxix. 105, a *lamp*.

gnaashaan, means *smoke* arising from the incense, when the patriarch offered the sacrifices; which as above, was commanded to be always offered; then the glory appeared in the cloud, or smoke arising from the incense; the words mean a *shining smoke*. Much has been conjectured by all commentators, as to the manner of the appearance in the cloud of the incense. This however will enable us to determine, how it was that they were made sensible of the Divine presence; for here we are told that it was a *shining smoke*. That is, when the smoke of the incense ascended and covered the mercy-seat, a shining appearance was seen in the cloud.

And a burning lamp. The word *eset* *lappid* *est*, means a *torch of fire*.

That passed. *gabar*, is the third person singular preter, *he passed*; and *asher*, rendered by *that*, is connected with it in this division of the proposition, as is signified by the stop *aton*; and thus it should be rendered by the adverb *where*, viz. *where he passed*. That is, where the glory of God passed, when he accepted the sacrifice.

Between those pieces. The word *gezaarim*, has not any such signification as *pieces* in the original. It means to *separate, divide*; as a noun plural, with *ha*, prefixed, the

20 Also the Hittites, and the Perizzites, and the Rephaims.

21 And the Amorites, and the Canaanites, and the Girgashites, and the Jebusites.

CHAP. XVI.

NOW Sarai the wife of Abram, bare not to him: but she had a maiden Egyptian, and her name was Hagar.

2 Then Sarai said to Abram, Behold now JEHOVAH hath restrained me from bearing; go I pray thee to my maiden; perhaps I shall obtain of her: and Abram hearkened, to the voice of Sarai.

3 So Sarai the wife of Abram, took Hagar the Egyptian her maiden, at the end of ten years, after Abram had dwelt ten years in the land of Canaan: and she gave her to Abram her husband, to him for a wife.

4 Then he came to Hagar, and she conceived: when she saw that she had conceived; then her mistress was despised, in her eyes.

5 Now Sarai said to Abram, My injury is through thee; I have given my maiden to thy bosom, when she saw that she conceived, then I was despised in her eyes: JEHOVAH shall judge between me and thee.

divisions: viz. the divisions of these. The whole proposition reads, Then behold, a shining smoke, and a torch of fire, where he passed between these divisions.

NOTES ON CHAP. XVI.

8. From the common version it has been supposed by some commentators, that the person who conversed with Hagar, was an immortal being, because he is improperly called, the angel of Jehovah. Therefore this word has here been applied to the Messiah, as being one of the persons of the Trinity, because the common version makes him say, *I will multiply thy seed exceedingly.*

I have shewn, that God had, from the fall, ordained a medium of communication by the Cherubim, in the Holy of Holies; and that by this medium only, man could commune with him. We also find, that the word מלאך *malak*, rendered, *angel*, literally means a messenger, and so it is rendered in various parts of scripture. Thus those who communicated the commands of God to the people, were called, *messengers of Jehovah*. The same is said in the Revelation; *To the angel (αγγελος; angelos,) of the church of Ephesus.*

From the narrative, we also find, that this place where the messenger of Jehovah found her, was appropriated to the worship of God; for in the 13th verse it is said, *Thou God hast seen me: surely, she said, Thus also have I looked after him that seeth me.* That is, here, in this place, in this tabernacle, where she went to lay her case before him, and to receive advice from the messenger of Jehovah, the officiating priest.

The words, *Thou God hast seen me*, also inform us, that the

6 But Abram said to Sarai, Behold, thy maiden is in thy hand; do to her, what is right in thy eyes: so Sarai humbled her, and she fled from her face.

7 Now the messenger of JEHOVAH found her by a fountain of water, in the wilderness, by the fountain in the way of Shur;

8 And he said, Hagar, maiden of Sarai, whence comest thou? and whither art thou going? and she said, From the face of Sarai my mistress, I flee.

9 Then the messenger of JEHOVAH said to her, Return to thy mistress; and submit thyself, under her hand.

10 For he informed the messenger of JEHOVAH concerning her; To a multitude I will multiply thy posterity; that he shall not be numbered, for multitude.

11 Also the messenger of JEHOVAH said to her; Behold thyself pregnant, now thou wilt bear a son, and thou shalt call his name, Ishmael; because JEHOVAH hath hearkened, to thine affliction;

12 And he will be a fruitful man, his hand will be against all; and the hand of all against him: nevertheless he will dwell in the presence of all his brethren.

person she conversed with, was not God: the sacred writer could not have said, what was altogether unnecessary to be said, had this person been God. For in the former part of the narrative, this same person finds her, converses with her; and advises her to return to her mistress. Besides, this same person, the messenger of Jehovah, the officiating priest, says to her in the 11th verse, *Jehovah hath hearkened to thine affliction*; consequently this person could not be God, as she could not thus address these words to him. But they were truly applicable to God, who in his providence had seen her, and had sent his messenger to her, with the communication respecting Ishmael; and therefore she said, *Thou God hast seen me.*

The cause of this erroneous application, arises from the improper translation of *שמע ואומר*, which in these three verses, the 9th, 10th, and 11th, is translated, *and he said*, without any attention to the idiom of the verb, which has different modes of expression, yet all partaking of the meaning of the root. As *say, speak, talk, declare, relate, think, resolve, command, told, informed*: the last word is the true meaning in this verse. The messenger of God at this tabernacle, had received a communication respecting the son of Abraham. With the pluperfect tense, which occurs here, the minor proposition reads thus, *for he (God) had informed the angel of Jehovah concerning her*. Thus by the communication, God had informed the messenger; the pronoun *he*, refers not to the messenger, but to the most proximate noun Jehovah, in the preceding verse.

The major proposition then reads, *For he (God) told the messenger of Jehovah concerning her; exceedingly I will multiply thy posterity.*

13 Then she called the name of JEHOVAH who promised concerning her; Thou God hast seen me: truly, she said, thus also here I have been convinced, afterwards respecting myself;

14 Therefore he called the well; a well of life respecting me. Behold, it is between Kadesh, and Bered.

15 Then Hagar bare to Abram, a son; and Abram called the name of his son, whom Hagar brought forth, Ishmael.

16 Now Abram was eighty and six years old, when Hagar bare Ishmael to Abram.

CHAP. XVII.

¶ WHEN Abram was, ninety and nine years old, again JEHOVAH appeared to Abram, and he said, to him, *I am* God Almighty; walk thyself before my face, and be upright.

From which it appears, by the true translation, that the person who conversed with her, was not an angel, an immortal immaterial spirit, nor Jehovah himself, as has been supposed. Therefore it necessarily follows, that he was the officiating priest at that tabernacle, to whom these communications were given, and in consequence of which, he was directed to send Hagar back to the house of Abraham.

13. *The name of the Lord that spake unto her.* By this translation we understand, that the name of the person who spake to her, was not the angel of Jehovah, but that he was Jehovah himself; viz. JEHOVAH that spake unto her. The reader will to a certainty decide at once, that both these statements cannot be true. If he were the angel of Jehovah, who found her, then he could not be Jehovah. But as we find that the former was not, according to the common opinion, an angel sent from heaven to advise Hagar to return to her mistress; so we shall also find that the other was not Jehovah, who spake to her.

The word *הוֹדִיבִּי* *hadobbi*, rendered that spake, is in the common version applied to Jehovah, who is thus expressly said to have spoken to her himself. It however cannot be allowed, that the ineffable Jehovah should appear to her as a man, and converse with her; because he has declared that he would only speak with man from above the Cherubim, Exod. xxv. 22; and that no one could see him and live, xxxiii. 20.

The translators, therefore, should have translated this word consistently with these views, and in conformity with its obvious application; which, according to idiom, means *spake, declare, promise, command*; Jer. xxxii. 42, *have promised*; Exod. xii. 15; Deut. i. 11; Josh. xxiv. 4; 1 Kings ii. 24, &c.; which, with *he*, prefixed, is relative, and reads *who promised*.

הוֹדִיבִּי *Eleyeh*, is rendered, *unto her*; has this meaning in various parts of scripture, but not with the construction it has in this passage, where we are told, in the common version, that *Jehovah spake to her*. This word is a compound of *אל* *al*, *to, for, concerning*, with the feminine termination, and should be rendered here, *by concerning her*: the clause reads thus, *The name of Jehovah who promised concerning her*; that is, who by the communication to the messenger of the tabernacle, had made the promise concerning Ishmael.

14. *Wherefore the well was called, Beer lahai roi.* The translators have not attempted to give the translation, of *לְהַי רֹאִי*

2 For I will give my covenant, between me and thee; also I will multiply thee exceedingly.

3 Then Abram fell before his face: for God had promised him saying;

4 Before me, behold, my covenant, is with thee: yea thou shalt be a father, of many nations.

5 Moreover, neither shall thy name, again be called Abram: but thy name shall be Abraham; for a father of many nations, I have given thee.

6 Yea I will make thee exceedingly fruitful; and will appoint thee for nations: even kings shall go forth from thee.

7 Thus I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and after thee between thy posterity in their generations, for an everlasting covenant: to be for thee, before God; and after thee, for thy posterity.

8 Yea I will give to thee, and after thee, to

לְהַי רֹאִי *beer lahai roi*. But surely, names of places or things should not be retained in the original language, when by the translation they give information and a consistent sense.

The word *לְהַי* *lahai*, is in the common version rendered in the Niphal conjugation, viz. *was called*; but it is the third person singular preter in *Kal*, or the active conjugation, viz. *he called*; that is, the messenger of Jehovah called the well.

לְהַי *Lehai*, literally means, *of life*, and *רֹאִי* *roi*, *respecting me*, from *רָאָה* *raah*, *to see, to respect*. The clause reads, *he hath called the well; a well of life respecting me*. Which kept her in remembrance concerning Ishmael.

NOTES ON CHAP. XVII.

1. *Appeared.* Here the pluperfect, or remote preter, occurs, Heb. *had appeared*; which shews that prior to this period, Abram had been a worshipper of the true God, under the name of *אל שדי* *El Shaddai, God Almighty*. And yet we find that the name Jehovah was known to him, ch. xv. 2;—xiv. 22, *I have lift up mine hand unto Jehovah*. A customary phrase in Hebrew, meaning those in the priesthood who elevated the offerings at the altar, called here *lifting the hand*. Hence it appears, that Abram was not an idolater when he lived at Ur of the Chaldees; for when God called him he did not express any surprise; he knew Jehovah, the God he worshipped; he received the divine command in the usual way, from between the Cherubim; and he without hesitation obeyed. But had he been an idolater, he would have doubted, and would have said with Pharaoh, *Who is Jehovah, that I should obey him?* Thus it appears, that the true church of God descended in regular succession, through the patriarchal churches to Abram, while in Chaldea, where, at that period, when Chaldea was a rising nation, all strangers were permitted to worship in their own way. But when they got power, all were put to death who would not bow to the image.

And be thou perfect. Much has been said on this word by writers and commentators in all Christian nations, and many, from the translation of the original word *תָּמִים* *tamim*, have presumed to conclude, that they had attained to a state of perfection in holiness. There is, no doubt, a very material distinction to be made between the words *perfect*, and *upright*, or *sincere*; for by these words the original is to be rendered, agreeably to its various

thy posterity, the land where thou art a sojourner, with all the land of Canaan; for an

inflections and application. It must of necessity be allowed, that perfection can only be applied to God. I shall therefore make that distinction agreeably to the original, which will shew us when the word should be translated *perfect*, and when it should not. The word *תָּמִיד* *tamid* is used by the sacred writers, to mean that which is complete according to its order, but it is never used in any part of scripture to signify perfection as applicable to man. For as there is no medium between perfection and imperfection, that which is not absolutely perfect, must necessarily in some degree be imperfect. Therefore the word in this verse should have been translated as it is in other parts of scripture, as may be seen in the following passages, where it is applied to man; 2 Sam. xxi. 24, 26; Job xii. 4; Psa. xviii. 23, 25, UPRIGHT; Psa. xv. 2;—xxxiv. 11; Prov. xxviii. 18; Amos v. 10, UPRIGHTLY; Psa. cxix. 8, sound.

In Job ch. i. 2, *תָּמִיד* *tamid* is rendered *perfect*; viz. *and that man was perfect*. But this is an error also, for with this construction it is, throughout the scripture, translated by *integrity*, *upright*, *uprightly*; Isa. xlv. 21;—xvii. 1;—vii. 8; 2 Sam. xv. 11; Prov. xi. 3;—x. 9;—xiii. 6; Job iv. 6;—xxviii. 6.

3. *And Abram fell on his face*. The word *לִפְנֵי* *liphnei* has here the same rendering, as it has with the same construction in other parts of scripture; Exod. xxvii. 21; 1 Sam. xxi. 15. Abram was now receiving the divine communication *before* the Cherubim; and when he was informed that the covenant was to be established with him and his posterity, with great humility he *fell before his face*, viz. before the face of God. So that instead of the word *לִפְנֵי* *liphnei* having any reference to the face of Abram, it evidently refers to the presence of God, who was at this important crisis communing with him in the Holy of Holies.

4. *As for me*. The word *אֵינִי* *ani* cannot have this meaning: the translation has no connexion with the following words, they do not make sense, viz. *As for me, behold my covenant is with thee*. The words *as for me*, are obviously unmeaning and unnecessary. *אֵינִי* *Ani* is a compound word, of *אֵין* *an*, a place, that which is present; Gen. xv. 2; 2 Kings vi. 8, *where*; Ruth ii. 19; Gen. xxxvii. 30, *whither*. And with the first person, *יְהוָה* *i. e. me*, it reads, *before me, behold my covenant is with thee*. So that the sacrificial worship had descended to Abram in Chaldea; and therefore the expression *before me*, viz. before my altar, before the Cherubim, my covenant, my sacrifice is with thee. Thus we have a consistent sense, and avoid the unmeaning expression, *as for me*; which, as observed, has no sense applicable, nor any authority in the original.

5. To this period the name of the patriarch was *ABRAM*, but when the covenant was to be established with him, his name was changed to *ABRAHAM*. This change of name was made by God himself, when Abram was prostrate before him; that is, when he was worshipping God in the holy place, before the Cherubim, ver. 3, agreeably to the order of that dispensation.

We are commanded to search the scriptures; they were given for our instruction; and as God has given nothing but what is fraught with wisdom, it may be useful to assign a reason for this change which took place in the name of Abram. In the preceding verse, God speaks with Abram from between the Cherubim, this being his own appointed way by which he was pleased to commune with fallen man; and says *ברית איתך* *berithi itaaka*, MY COVENANT is with thee. The word covenant, as it has respect to man, is not the true meaning of *ברית* *berithi*; I shall therefore endeavour to give the true meaning conveyed by this word, agreeably to the idiom of the Hebrew.

everlasting possession: and I will be before them, for a God.

It must appear evident that the parties who make a covenant together, bind themselves to perform all the particulars signified by such covenant; and therefore that there must necessarily be a power in each party to choose or refuse any of the articles contained in such covenant; in short, that they must be equal in power, and uncontrollable in their wills. This is all perfectly right as it applies to a covenant made between man and man, but most certainly it would be the very height of folly and presumption for man to suppose that such a covenant could be made between him and God, for there is no kind of moral fitness on the part of man to enter into an agreement or covenant with Him who only is perfect.

This word means to *purify*, to *cleanse*, Jer. iv. 11;—li. 11; *בַּרְתָּ בְּרִית* *Baal Berith*, or *Baal the purifier*, Jud. viii. 33;—ix. 4. This idol was called *בְּרִית אֱלֹהִים* *el berith*, the *god Berith*, originally applied to God the purifier. Under this name they worshipped the material light, from perceiving the effects of that glorious agent in nature; attributing to it, through a corrupt tradition, what the true light only can do in the spiritual, by purifying and cleansing from sin.

Now as man cannot in any sense whatever be considered as a contracting party in the *בְּרִית* *berith*, or *purifying sacrifice*, it necessarily means, as its root signifies, a *grant of favour*, a *deed of gift*, freely bestowed, and solemnly assured by the most high God. And agreeably to this view, God says, *אֵתָנָה בְּרִיתִי* *atah-nah berithi*, I will give my purifier, ver. 2, not I will make.

And again, ver. 7, *בְּרִיתִי* *berithi*, For I have established my purifier, between me and thee, for thy posterity. Therefore when God gave to Abram this *purifying sacrifice*, he said, Thy name shall be *Abra-ham*, he put in a letter which makes a part of his sacred name *יְהוָה* *JEHOVAH*, which means the *God of the Deity*, the *FATHER of men*, saying, *for thou shalt be a father of many nations*. This second syllable in the divine name, also means the *present*, as the first and the last comprehend the *future* and the *preter*, viz. *יְהוָה* *Je*, the *future*, *וְהוּא* *Ho*, the *present*, and *וְהָיָה* *Vah*, the *preter*, or *past time*. So that by this change of the name of Abram to that of Abraham, the patriarch and his posterity knew that God promised to be present with them; that is, to commune with them from between the Cherubim. Thus we see, that this word *berith*, had a decided reference to the Messiah, whether it be translated by *purifier*, or by *covenant*; that the principal letter in the divine name, which was put into the name of Abram, was understood by him and Moses to signify, that the spirit of Jehovah was to be manifested by this divine character, to whom all the sacrifices pointed, and to whom all the prophets gave witness; who was in the fulness of time to bruise the head of the serpent, by this root of the divine nature manifested by him, even the true Messiah, the Redeemer of men.

7. *To be a God unto thee*. This translation is not consistent with the original; for the *לֵאמֹר* *lamed*, prefixed to *אֱלֹהִים* *Elohim* is omitted in the common version. The obvious meaning is, that Abraham was to promulgate the sacrificial worship, the covenant respecting the promised redemption by Messiah, in the land of Canaan; which was filled with idolatry; and which he was to publish *before God*, i. e. before the altar of God, among that people, as it had been handed down in the church to him. Accordingly he built altars, and published the promised redemption, in the tabernacles *before God*. Therefore this clause does not read as in the common version, *to be to thee a God*, but it refers to the *בְּרִית* *berith*, i. e. *covenant*; it is then said, *to be*

9 Likewise God said, to Abram; But thou shalt keep my covenant: thou and after thee, thy posterity in their generations.

10 This is my covenant which ye shall keep, between me, and you; and after thee, thy posterity: Circumcise among you, every male.

11 For ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin; so it shall be for a token of covenant, between me and you.

12 Now a son of eight days, shall be circumcised among you, every male in your generations, born in the house, or redeemed with money, even every son of a stranger; he who is not of thy posterity.

13 He that is born in thy house, or redeemed with money, he shall circumcise: then my covenant is in your flesh, for an everlasting covenant.

14 Yea the uncircumcised male, who will not circumcise the flesh of his foreskin, even that soul shall be cut off from the people: for my covenant he hath broken.

15 ¶ Thou God said to Abraham; Thou shalt not call the name, of Sarai thy wife, Sarai: but Sarah, is her name.

16 For I will bless her, and also I will give to thee a son of her: thus I will bless her, and she shall be for nations; kings of people, shall be from her.

17 Then Abraham fell before his face, and he laughed: also he said in his heart, What shall a son be born to him of a hundred years? and also Sarah; a daughter of ninety years, shall she bear?

18 Also Abraham said, before God: Suffer Ishmael, shall he live before thy face?

19 Then God said, Nevertheless Sarah thy wife shall bear to thee a son; and thou shalt call his

name Isaac: for I will establish my covenant by him, an everlasting covenant, after him in his posterity.

20 Also for Ishmael, I have heard thee; behold, I have blessed him, and will make him fruitful, yea I will cause him to multiply, exceedingly: twelve princes he shall beget; and I will appoint him, for a great nation.

21 But my covenant I will establish with Isaac; whom Sarah shall bear to thee, about this time, in the next year.

22 Then he ceased to speak with him; and God ascended, from before Abraham.

23 So Abraham took Ishmael his son, even with all born in his house, also all redeemed with his money; every male among the men, of the house of Abraham: and he circumcised the flesh of their foreskin, on this same day, when God had spoken with him.

24 Now Abraham, was ninety and nine years old, when he circumcised the flesh of his foreskin.

25 And Ishmael his son; was thirteen years old: when he circumcised him; in the flesh of his foreskin.

26 On this same day, Abraham circumcised, and Ishmael, his son.

27 Also all the men of his house, born in the house; or redeemed with money, of the son of the stranger: they were circumcised, with him.

CHAP. XVIII.

¶ **M**OREOVER JEHOVAH appeared unto him; in the plains of Mamre; where he continued opening the tabernacle, about the heat of the day.

with thee before God. So that instead of the clause being applied to God, as being a God to Abraham, which can have no such application, as he had been, and was then, a God to him, it is applied to the *vera* *berith*, the covenant which was to be with Abraham, and his posterity, before God.

13. *Bought with money.* That is, redeemed among those of the surrounding nations, who had been taken in war: Neh. v. 8. *וּמִן הַכּוֹנָנוֹת, we have redeemed.* The laws of the Hebrews did not allow of a traffic in slaves, nor to consider them as such: they were acts of mercy: the law for the stranger was the same as the law for the native, to redeem them from the hand of the captors, for which redemption they were hired for the term of six years.

18, 19, 20. *O that Ishmael might live before thee!* His prayer was granted; Ishmael was to be the progenitor of a great nation, whose establishment, manners, and customs, were to be much like those of the Hebrews; and we find that their

government was to be managed by the heads of twelve tribes, who were princes. The communication respecting Ishmael is given in chap. xvi. 12, *he shall dwell in the presence of his brethren.* Thus though the covenant, the atoning sacrifice, signifying the Messiah, was to be with Isaac, viz. that the Messiah should be in his line; yet the descendants of Ishmael were *וַיֵּשְׁבוּ, to dwell, abide, govern,* in the presence of their brethren; they were to be a distinct people. Ishmael settled in Arabia: from him the Arabians descended; and notwithstanding great efforts have been made by very powerful nations to crush them as a people, by incorporating them with themselves, neither power nor craft have been able to frustrate the divine decree: they dwell in the presence of their brethren the Hebrews to this day. Their laws, as Newton remarks, are much the same; they retain the same habits and customs; they both profess to have received the rite of circumcision from Abraham; and it is singular that Ishmael

2 Then he raised his eyes and looked; and beheld, three men, deputies to him: when he saw, then he hastened to meet them before the opening of the tabernacle; and he bowed himself toward the ground.

3 And he said: My Lord, if now I have found favour in thy sight; thou wilt not now pass, from before thy servant.

4 Take now a little water; and bathe ye your feet: and rest yourselves, under the tree;

5 Then I will fetch a portion of bread, and ye shall comfort your hearts, afterward, ye shall proceed; for therefore came ye, to your servant:

as well as Jacob, had twelve sons, Gen. xxv. 16, *Twelve princes according to their nations*. They like the Hebrews marry in their own tribes, therefore they as well as the Hebrews, are witnesses of the accomplishment of the divine predictions, and of the truth of scripture history.

22. *Left off*. This expression is obsolete; *off*, is expletive *לֹא יָבֵל*, is one word, *he ceased*.

Went up. *לָךְ יַגְנָל*, is also one word, the third person singular. *he ascended*.

NOTES ON CHAP. XVIII.

1. *And he sat at the tent door*. It appears in the vulgar version, that Abraham was sitting at the tent door to cool himself: but we shall find that this was at the opening of the tabernacle for the celebration of divine worship, and where Abraham was the officiating priest.

The word *רֹאשׁ* *pathach*, is rendered *the tent door*; but it is here to be translated as it is in Josh. viii. 29, *entering, or opening*, xi. 4; Jud. ix. 35, 40, 44;—xviii. 6, 17. There then is no necessity for the words, *at the*, which are not only supplied, but made a part of the text in the vulgar version.

Many writers have thought that God appeared to Abraham in three distinct human forms, and that these represented the three persons of the Trinity; others that they were three angels; because after it is said, the Lord appeared unto him; it is also said in the next verse, that *he lift up his eyes and looked, and lo, three men stood by him*: but these conclusions are not at all consistent with the narrative. Were this the case, that these persons were Jehovah, or that they were three angels, was there any necessity for Abraham, when he knew the quality of his guests, to shew them the way, by going with them as a guide? for we read, verse 16, *Abraham went with them to bring them on the way*. Can it be supposed that heavenly beings, and even God himself, required a guide? What a state must modern religion be in, if this were true! Thus have Christians been represented as weak and irrational for supposing that the Creator of the universe, or angels, required a guide to direct them in the way. It cannot be said here that Abraham did not know the quality of the person who was speaking to him, because it is said in the 14th verse, *Is any thing too hard for the Lord? at the time appointed I will return unto thee, according to the time of life, and Sarah shall have a son*; therefore it must appear evident that this cannot be the meaning of the original. Neither is it the true meaning as it even stands in the translation: and it is astonishing that commentator after commentator should have fallen into this error, by giving a meaning to this narrative which is as inconsistent with truth, as it is

and they said; So thou shalt do, accordingly as thou hast spoken.

6 Now Abraham hastened to the tabernacle, to Sarah: and he said, Hasten three measures of fine flour, knead, and make cakes.

7 Then Abraham ran to the herd: and he ordered a heifer, tender and good, which he gave to the youth; and he hastened to dress him.

8 Also he ordered the butter and milk, with the heifer, that he prepared; which he set in their presence: then he stood before them, under the tree, and they ate.

9 Moreover they said to him; Where is

contrary to common sense. But we shall find the whole perfectly to agree with reason, without supposing what was never meant by the writer, viz. that these three men constituted the Divine being, or that they were three angels.

Agreeably to the original, it does not appear that Abraham considered these three men, or one of them, to be Jehovah; but as three travellers, fatigued with the heat of the day, which is evident, because he addresses them as such, and says, *Let a little water, I pray you, be fetched, and wash your feet, and rest yourselves under the tree, and I will fetch a morsel of bread, and comfort ye your hearts, after that ye shall pass on, for therefore are ye come unto your servant*. From these last words it appears, that Abraham knew the quality of his guests, viz. *for therefore are ye come unto your servant*. And also when, after this, he knew the quality of his guests, he went with them to shew them the way to the cities of the plain as above. But had those three men been three angels, or had one of them been Jehovah, Abraham would not have presumed to have done any such thing. The question then is, who were these three men that were sent on this mission to Sodom? this I shall endeavour to ascertain by the evidence of scripture.

It must necessarily appear, that there was an ancient church which had existed from the time of Noah to Abraham, and which did not come to its end until the time of Moses, when the dispensation was renewed, and the Israelish church was established; which is proved from various parts of ancient scripture. Abraham was met by one higher in the priestly office than himself; Melchizedek was the king of Salem, which was the old name for Jeru-salem, i.e. THE CITY OF PEACE; and he was a priest of the most high God. That is, *he was a priest of the most high God* in reality; not that this was Christ, as has been supposed by some commentators. See on ch. xiv. He is thus called by way of distinction from the idolatrous priests of that day, and was the high priest of the sanctuary at Salem, where Abraham was commanded to take Isaac. That Melchizedek was the high-priest is plain; for it is said, *the less was blessed of the greater*, when Abraham and the kings with all the army partook of his hospitality.

The Psalmist refers to this ancient tabernacle in Ps. lxxvi. 2, *In Salem also is his tabernacle*; but this is as it stands in the English translation, which is not the true sense of the Hebrew. It surely ought to have occurred to the translators and commentators, that there was no necessity for David to inform the people of Jerusalem who were celebrating divine worship in the temple, that the temple was in Jerusalem. The word *וּבְיָמֵינוּ* *Paydin*, which is rendered to mean present time, should have been translated by the preter of *to be*; viz. *was*, which then

Sarah thy wife? and he said, Behold in the Tabernacle.

10 Then he said, Returning I will come to thee, about the time of life; when behold, Sarah thy wife will have a son: and Sarah heard at the opening of the tabernacle, for she was behind him.

reads, *In Salem was his tabernacle*, for David was speaking of the ancient state of the church before Moses, when Jerusalem was called Salem. This shows, as I have before observed, that there were tabernacles, and Bethels, i. e. houses of God, in the time of Abraham.

That this church was superior in many things will appear. With the Israelitish church it pleased God to communicate with his people by the Urim and the Thummim; but in this church, which was prior to the time of Moses, we do not meet with Urim and Thummim; God communicated with man only from the Cherubim.

The Ark and Cherubim had descended from Adam through the line of Seth to the patriarch Jacob; were brought by the children of Israel out of Egypt, and were with them in the wilderness before that which was erected by Moses, as observed.

I now come to the more immediate application of this singular passage, viz. *and he looked up, and lo, three men stood by him*. The word *נִצְּבִים* *nitsabim*, which is in the authorised version rendered *stood*, viz. *three men stood by him*; cannot be so translated: for if they had stood by him, it could not have been said in the same verse, that *he ran to meet them*. When this word is applied to persons, it means *officers*, or *deputies*, 1 Kings iv. 7. 19;—xxii. 47. Also in ch. v. 16, the same word, both consonants and vowels, means *officers*. I have therefore, in conformity with other parts of scripture, thus translated the word, which obviates the inconsistency as it stands in the authorised version. These were men and priests of that church, who were commanded by God, in that established way of communication, to go from Salem to Sodom, and to declare its destruction.

It is the generally received opinion that the patriarch at this time resided in a solitary part of the country; but it will be found that the fruitful plains of Mamre were well peopled, and that Abraham was not only a *mighty prince*, ch. xxi. 6, but that he was also, by virtue of his dignity, the actual officiating priest in that part of the country. In conformity with this view of the subject, the following words *נִצְּבִים* *paathah ha ohel*, are rendered, *the tent door*. But the word *נִצְּבִים* *Ahol*, means here, *the tabernacle*, Exod. xxvii. 21; Deut. xxxi. 16; Psa. lxxviii. 67, &c. where Abraham was waiting to officiate at the altar. At which time the three men here mentioned, came also to worship in the tabernacle on their way to the cities of the plain; which were to be destroyed. It also appears that they came from Salem, or Jerusalem; because as that was the place where God had chosen to fix his name there, we find that all communications which had respect to things of a national nature, were issued from Salem, or Jerusalem. It must also appear, that these men who were sent by their superior at Salem, (who, no doubt, was Melchizedek) came with a mission to preach to that people, in order to induce a reformation of manners among them; for we find throughout the scriptures that God never proceeds to extremities without mercifully offering an opportunity for repentance.

10. This will lead me to make a few remarks on the 10th

11 Now Abraham and Sarah were old, the days had come; it had ceased to be with Sarah, according to the custom of women.

12 Therefore Sarah laughed, within herself, saying: After it hath ceased to be with me, shall I have satisfaction, when my lord is old?

13 Afterward JEHOVAH said concerning Abra-

verse of this chapter, where the above words occur. It is said, *I will certainly return unto thee according to the time of life, and lo, Sarah thy wife shall have a son; and Sarah heard it in the tent door*, *וַיִּשְׁמָע וְהָיָה וְהָיָה אַחֲרָיו* *ve hua achearao, which was behind him*. But these words thus rendered, are not consistent with the original, and cannot be applied to make sense of the passage. The pronoun relative, *which*, and the verb, *was*, are not in the Hebrew, consequently this cannot be the true translation. Instead of the pronoun relative, we have *וְהָיָה* *hwa*, the pronoun of the third person singular, *he*; and *אַחֲרָיו* *achearao*, the word which is rendered *behind him*, is with this construction to be translated as the same word is in Numb. xvi. 25; Jud. ix. 4; 1 Sam. xiii. 7; 2 Sam. xi. 8, *followed him*, viz. *and he followed him*. These words were delivered to Abraham at the time when the chief man who spake to him was about to depart to Sodom; when he informed the patriarch that they came on a mission from Salem to him, concerning the birth of Isaac, as well as to the people of Sodom. It is then said, *וַיִּשְׁמָע וְהָיָה וְהָיָה אַחֲרָיו* *ve hua achearao, and he followed him*; that is, the stranger who was the speaker to Abraham, followed him, who, according to the 16th verse, *went with them to bring them on the way*.

11. There is a repetition in this verse which has often been objected to, with great propriety certainly, viz. *Now Abraham and Sarah were old, and well stricken in age*. It certainly must strike the reader with a manifest impropriety, such a one as no writer or speaker, knowing how to write or speak with accuracy, could be guilty of; for most surely the inspired writer could not say, that they were *old and well stricken in age*. *בָּאֵימָתָם* *baayim bayasim*, is translated, *well stricken in age*. *בָּאֵימָתָם* *Bayim*, means to *come*, to *approach*, to an object, or state, Numb. xxiv. 2; *בָּאֵימָתָם* *baayim*, when ye come, Josh. xi. 16; Jud. ix. 31; come, 2 Sam. xix. 41. Also *בָּאֵימָתָם* *bayasim*, literally means, *days*, a time, a season, comprehending a great many days, Gen. xxvi. 8; *when he had been there* *בָּאֵימָתָם* *bayasim*, a long time, Numb. xx. 15; a season, Gen. xl. 4. And as the words are connected with the perfect, or remote preter, it reads, *for the days had come*. The whole verse then reads correctly thus: *Now Abraham and Sarah were old, for the days had come, the custom of women ceased to be with Sarah*. In this last clause in the authorised version *וְהָיָה* *orach*, which means a path, a race, a custom; is rendered, *after the manner*. So that two words are supplied which are not necessary. Also the neuter pronoun *it*, for which there is no authority in the Hebrew, is added to introduce *וְהָיָה* *chaadal*, viz. *it ceased*. By the new translation, we not only get rid of the objection as to the repetition of the ages of Abraham and Sarah, but we have not a word superfluous: the passage is word for word the same as the Hebrew.

13. *Wherefore did Sarah laugh?* This verse in the original exhibits one of the most striking pictures of a mind wishing to believe, and yet overpowered by the apparent impossibility that can possibly be found in any language. I have as closely followed the Hebrew as our language will admit of. The new translation of this verse will require some skill even in reading.

ham: Why is this? Sarah laughed, saying, What! How? I truly! Shall I bear? even I? I am old!

14 This wonderful matter, is from JEHOVAH: at the time appointed, I will return to thee, about the time of life, for Sarah will have a son.

15 Then Sarah denied, saying, I laughed not, for she feared: but he said, Nay, truly thou didst laugh.

16 Now the men arose from thence; and looked, towards the front of Sodom; and Abraham was going to put them forward.

17 But JEHOVAH said: Shall I conceal from Abraham; what I am doing?

18 Because Abraham, shall certainly be, for

to give the true emphasis and feeling of the spirit in which it was spoken. The speaker says, Why thus? Sarah laughed, saying, What!—How? I truly! Shall I bear? even I? I am old! All these various changes of passion are signified by their proper accents, without the knowledge of which it is not possible to have the true reading. Thus after the conflict of contending passions, the impossibility of the thing is pointed out by the following words: *I am old*.

The common version of this passage is dull: there is no authority for the word *did*, *נא לא* *laaph*, which is a compound of *na* *ha*, i. e. *what!* and *na aph*, *how?* is omitted, which is peculiarly striking. *ואני* *vaani*, is also omitted, which is equally as important to give the passage its full effect, viz. *even I?*

13. It appears that the priests among this ancient people, who always resided in the tabernacles, first made an offering of their provisions for the day to God on their altar. And it also appears that it was during this solemnity, for a calf was prepared on the occasion, that God communed again with Abraham respecting the promise of a son; which communication had also been made to his guests, who came from the tabernacle at Salem (as above). And therefore it was then that God said to Abraham, during the time of the offering at this sacrificial repast, *Wherefore did Sarah laugh, saying, Shall I of a surety bear a child who am old?* It is also said in the preceding chapter that Abraham laughed; but we find a great difference between the laughter of Abraham and that of Sarah; Abraham laughed with a believing heart; but Sarah with an unbelieving heart, and was reproved.

16. *And Abraham went.* Was preparing to go with them while they were yet in the tabernacle; for *וַיֵּלֶךְ* *kolakee* is participial, and not the third person singular preter of the verb, which gives us a rational view of the subject. Abraham was preparing to go with them, when they were stopped, as we shall see below.

17. We must be careful to make a proper distinction between the men who visited Abraham, on their way to Sodom, and God, who in this verse is recorded as conversing with Abraham. They were on the point of departing from the sacrificial repast in the tabernacle, when God said from the Cherubim to the superior visitor, who was at the altar, *Shall I hide from Abraham that thing which I do?* The words, *that thing*, are supplied. Heb. *Shall I conceal from Abraham what I do?* It also further appears, from this and the following verses to the end of the 19th, that this communication was given to the visitors, who were in

a great nation, and mighty: yea all the nations of the earth, shall be blessed by him;

19 Surely I have acknowledged him, for this end, because he will command his children, and his house after him; and they shall keep the way of JEHOVAH; to do justice, and judgment: for this end, JEHOVAH will bring upon Abraham; even what he hath spoken, concerning him.

20 Then JEHOVAH said; The cry of Sodom and Gomorrah, surely is great: for their sin is certainly very grievous.

21 I will descend now, yea I will distinguish; if according to the complaint, they have made, that is come before me; it endeth: if not, I will favor it.

the priestly office at Salem; for Abraham is mentioned in the third person: they no doubt approached the divine presence in the tabernacle where Abraham resided, and came from his superior at Salem, which was the reason why he addressed them as such, and gave this preference to them.

19. *That the Lord may bring.* This is incorrect. It appears, that the bringing forth of the promise of Messiah, depended on the house of Abraham keeping the way of Jehovah, viz. *that the Lord may bring.* But the promise of God did not depend on the will, obedience, or work of man. He had declared, that the posterity of the woman should bruise the *וְרִישׁ רֶגֶל* *rosh, head*, or principles; of the serpent. Therefore the clause, *that the Lord may bring*, cannot be admitted.

I have observed, that there is no subjunctive mood in Hebrew, so that the word *may* is improper; and the *נא* *ha*, prefixed to *וַיֵּלֶךְ* *bia*, reads, *with this word thus, because; viz. because Jehovah will bring.*

21. Abraham is then informed of the particulars concerning the mission to the cities of the plain, and in the following verse we are told, that the men went towards Sodom, *but Abraham was yet standing before Jehovah*, viz. in the tabernacle before the Cherubim, in order to entreat God for the safety of Lot, which entreaty finishes the chapter. *Abraham was yet standing*; signifying that he had been standing, or officiating, before God. Hence the propriety of the participle active *וַיֵּלֶךְ* *gnomeed, standing*; as it is in the original, instead of the third person singular preter, *he stood*, as in the vulgar version.

I will go down now and see. *וַיֵּלֶךְ* *Verah*, is rendered, *I will see*; but the speaker is God, therefore it cannot be so translated, as it supposes that he who knows all things, was ignorant of the transactions at Sodom. With the same radical form this word is rendered, *I will shew myself*, 1 Kings xviii. 15, *I will surely shew myself*; that is, I will manifest myself in judgment, if they do not repent. Again, it means to consider, Ezek. xii. 3; Psa. viii. 3.

According to the cry. Heb. *complaint*, that was brought before God, at Salem, in the Holy of Holies: emphatically said, *that cometh before me.*

The following word *וְלֹא* *laalah*, which finishes the major proposition, is omitted in the common version. It means to consume, finish, or put an end to the thing in question, 1 Kings vi. 38; Job vii. 9; Jer. viii. 20. And thus it pointedly refers to the destruction of Sodom, and the cities of the plain.

22 Then the men turned from thence, and went towards Sodom; but Abraham, was yet standing in the presence of JEHOVAH.

If not, I will know. The reader must be convinced, that the common version of this clause cannot be right; the sacred writer could not apply such a term to the omniscient Creator; all things are known to him. This word has various applications. "Knowledge," says Taylor, "is various in kind, is variously used, and attended with various effects and circumstances; so this word is to be understood and translated." It means, to know, experience, discover, respect, favour, &c. Exod. i. 9, *knew not*, Heb. *favoured not*; — ii. 25; Ps. ci. 4, *I will not know* (favour) a wicked person; — exliv. 9, *takest knowledge of him*, Heb. *favourst him*. There is no word for *takest* in Heb. The last clause then reads, *if not, I will favour it*.

But there is another circumstance related in this narrative which appears altogether singular. We are told in the 2d verse, that Abraham saw three men coming toward him; in the 22d verse, *and the men turned their faces from thence, and went toward Sodom, but Abraham stood yet before the Lord*. Here the three men who were sent on this mission from Salem, are mentioned as departing for Sodom; but it appears that there were only two who went to Sodom, for the first verse of the next chapter says, *There came two angels to Sodom at even*. The word which is translated *angels*, has been by commentators understood to signify heavenly beings, sent down to destroy the cities of the plain. But *malachim*, does not here mean celestial beings; it means those sent on an embassy, or mission, missionaries; and it is generally translated *messengers*. It has the same meaning and application as *αγγελος*, *angelos*, viz. to the angel of the church of Sardis write; that is, to the resident minister, who was a messenger sent to preach to them. So that though this word is applied to the two men, it is no proof that they were beings superior to man, or visitors from the invisible world.

It appears then; that there were only two messengers sent from Salem to Sodom, that they were truly men agreeably to the express letter of scripture, viz. *שני אנשי שם* *haanashim*, the men.

Turned their faces from thence, and went towards Sodom. If they had been really angels, or immaterial beings, to a certainty they would not have been called men, after their quality was made known to Abraham; beside, this word is throughout the scripture applied to mortal men. Hence we learn, that they were strangers to this part of the country. It is also certain that the custom of seeing a traveller on his way who was a stranger, was always attended to by these hospitable people, and very ancient custom had made it a law; for we find 2000 years after this period, that a stranger could compel the magistracy in each respective place, to send a messenger with him to shew him the way; Matt. v. 41, *And whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain*. Now these things being understood, it is surely more rational, as well as it is consistent with the original, to conclude, that one of these three men came with them as a guide to the residence of Abraham, than to suppose what is altogether impossible, that the third man was Jehovah. The reason in the first instance, why they are mentioned as three men, and secondly as two, is plain; the first is a statement of the fact that Abraham saw three men; he did not then know that two of these were *שני אנשי שם* *malachim*, the messengers, or missionaries, for the word is plain enough. The *na* prefixed to the *שני אנשי שם* *malaachim*, messengers, is emphatic, and the first

23 Now Abraham drew near, and he said: Wilt thou also destroy, the righteous, with the wicked?

clause of the following chapter should be translated *and the two messengers came*, viz. the two men who were sent on this errand to the cities of the plain.

22. This also enables us to explain the passage, viz. *but Abraham stood yet before the Lord*, supposed by many commentators to be the third man, or Jehovah; before whom Abraham then stood. But the passage, *Abraham stood yet before the Lord*, has an obvious meaning which has not been apprehended by these writers. *נצח* *Gnomeed*, as observed, is rendered as the third person singular preter in Kal, viz. *he stood*; whereas it is the participle active, viz. *standing*. This will certainly make a material difference as to the meaning of the clause, which will then read, *but Abraham was yet standing in the presence of Jehovah*. Here the verb *נצח* *haayah*, is understood but not expressed, as it is in Job i. 1, the sense of which is, that while the men were on their journey to Sodom, Abraham was inquiring before God, agreeably to the order of that dispensation, who spoke to him from between the Cherubim in the Holy of Holies.

To make the Omnipotent subject to material nature, or to the order of time and space; in a moment to put on a material body, and to eat material food, as commentators have supposed, would be making the Creator a creature. Therefore, not only Abraham, but also the man who came with the messengers, was with him, *standing before the Lord*; which is sufficient to prove that this one man was not Jehovah. Well may objectors ridicule such definitions of the theology of the Bible, which are altogether incompatible with reason, common sense, and the literal meaning of the original. Thus have commentators after commentators, wandered from the truth, and have lost themselves in the labyrinth of error, by neglecting the original Hebrew.

That the words, *but Abraham was yet standing in the presence of Jehovah*, have the above meaning and application, so different to that which has hitherto been understood, will appear if we refer to those parts of scripture where these words *נצח* *lipneeh* Jehovah, *before the face of Jehovah*, occur; and this peculiar phrase is used, when application is made by the patriarchs and prophets for divine information. We shall be convinced that the words *before the Lord*, or *before the face of Jehovah*, as it is in the original, are always understood to appear before the Cherubim in the Holy of Holies, where he deigned to communicate with man. Exod. xxviii. 30, *and they shall be upon Aaron's heart when he goeth in* *נצח* *lipneeh* Jehovah, *before the face of Jehovah*, xxxiv. 6; Levit. x. 1, 2; Numb. v. 16, 18; 2 Sam. v. 14; 2 Kings xix. 14; Isa. xxxvii. 14; Micah vi. 6.

The obvious meaning of which must necessarily strike the intelligent reader to be as above; for the two messengers having informed Abraham of the nature of their mission to the people of Sodom, he naturally became anxious for the safety of his kinsman Lot, who he knew to be an upright man. He therefore presented himself *נצח* *lipneeh*, Jehovah, *before the face of Jehovah*, in the sanctuary, or most holy place; and consistently with the privilege of his office as priest, he inquired before God according to the manner of the dispensation of that ancient church. Hence the expression, *but Abraham was yet standing before Jehovah*. From which it appears that we have not any authority for the common opinion, either from the obvious meaning of the narrative or the literal meaning of the original

24 If there be fifty righteous, within the city; wilt thou destroy it? and not spare the place; because of the fifty righteous, that are within it?

25 This is far from thee to do, according to this thing, to consume the righteous with the wicked, that the righteous shall be like the wicked? it is far from thee; shall not the Judge of all the earth, execute according to judgment?

26 Then JEHOVAH said; If I find throughout Sodom, fifty righteous, within the city: then I will pardon even all the place, on their account.

27 But Abraham answered, and said: Behold I pray thee, I have presumed to speak to my LORD; even I, dust and ashes.

28 Perhaps there shall want of the fifty righteous five; wilt thou destroy the whole city, because of the five? and he said, I will not destroy it; if I find there, forty and five.

29 Moreover he sought again to speak before him, and he said; Perhaps forty shall be found there? and he said, I will not do it, because of the forty.

30 Then he said, Let not the LORD I pray thee be angry, and I will speak; If thirty be found there? and he said, I will not do it, if I find there thirty.

words; that the three men who came to Abraham were angels, or that one of them was Jehovah. The intelligent Christian who is of a contrite spirit, and trembles at the word of the awful Majesty of heaven, who dwelleth in the holy place, who stretcheth out the heavens as a curtain, in comparison of whom, the nations are but as the small dust of the balance, will disapprove of the injudicious and unscriptural conclusions of such writers on this important subject.

The above view of this part of scripture will relieve us from the charge of impossibilities, which objectors have brought against it, who have contended that "immortal beings could not possibly be fatigued, and consequently required no rest; neither could they eat material food, which, agreeably to the natural order of things, must necessarily produce flesh and blood." It also shews us, that as God had established a communication with his visible church before the time of Moses, there was no necessity for celestial beings to come from heaven, in order to communicate the intended destruction of the cities of the plain.

33. *And the Lord went his way.* This is a very undignified, awkward expression, when applied to God. There is not any authority for the words, *his way*, so that they are a comment on the original text. *לָךְ וְעַלֶּיךָ* *va yelak*, which is rendered, *went his way*, should be translated, as it is in other parts of scripture, by *depart*, Gen. xii. 4;—xxx. 35; Jud. xvii. 8; 2 Sam. vi. 19, &c. And as it is the third person singular preter, the clause reads properly thus, *Then Jehovah departed.*

31 Also he said, Behold, I pray thee, I have presumed to speak before my LORD; Perhaps twenty shall be found there? and he said, I will not destroy it, because of the twenty.

32 Furthermore he said, Let not anger be before my LORD I pray thee, for I will speak only this time; If ten be found there? and he said, I will not destroy it; because of the ten.

33 Then JEHOVAH went forth, as soon as he ceased, to commune with Abraham: and Abraham, returned to his place.

CHAP. XIX.

NOW two messengers came to Sodom at even, as Lot sat in the gate of Sodom: then Lot looked, and he rose to meet them; and bowed his face, towards the ground.

2 And he said, Behold now my lords, turn now into the house of your servant, and lodge, and bathe your feet; then ye shall rise, and go on your journey: but they said, No, surely we will abide, in the street.

3 Then he pressed them exceedingly, and they turned to him, and came, into his house, where he prepared for them, a feast; also baked unleavened bread, and they ate.

4 But before they rested; the men of the city, men of Sodom, turned about before the

NOTES ON CHAP. XIX.

1. *Two angels.* The word *מַלְאָכִים* *malakim* means *messenger*. The improper translation of this word abounds in scripture.

Lot sat in the gate of Sodom. Lot appears to have been a judge among this people, see ver. 9, *he will needs be a judge*. The judges always sat in the gate of the city, to administer justice. 2 Sam. xix. 8, *Behold, the king doth sit in the gate*. From which we learn that the people of these cities were governed by just laws, under the supreme government which was at Salem, or Jeru-salem: otherwise Lot, as a worshipper of the true God, could not have been a judge among this people. He appears to have been appointed to that office by the existing authority; and we shall find that these two *messengers* were deputed by the government to go on a mission to Sodom. There is one important thing which has been overlooked by commentators; it is said, *Lot sat in the gate of Sodom*. It is understood that Lot was resting himself at the gate, or entrance of the city; but it should be remembered, that by the phrase, *sat in the gate*, is meant to *rule, govern, to dispense the law*, as a chief magistrate; 1 Kings xxix. 9, *Solomon sitteth on the throne of the kingdom*; Exod. xviii. 14; Prov. xxxi. 23; Psa. ix. 4, *thou sittest in the throne of judgment*.

2. *Now my lords turn in.* Language too familiar for angels, or for strangers; therefore it appears that Lot knew them.

4, 5. There is not any authority in the Hebrew for the abominable crime attributed to these men by commentators ancient and modern. At this period, the great success which

house, both young, and old; the people from every quarter.

5 Then they called for Lot, and they said to him; Where *are* the men, for they came to thee, this night? bring them forth before us; for we will detect them.

6 Then Lot went forth to them, at the door; which he shut after him.

7 And he said: I pray my brethren, be not so wicked.

8 Behold now with me two daughters, who have not approved of man; I will bring them forth now to you; and ye, do ye to them, as is good in your eyes: only to these men do ye nothing; truly for this reason they came, under the protection of my roof.

9 Then they said, Stand back: also they had said, This one came to sojourn, and he hath executed judgment wrongfully; now we will

had attended the preaching of Abraham, was wonderful; the worship of God had in a great measure become the worship of the country, and the supreme government was at Salem, where Melchizedek was the high priest, and the king, under the dispensation given to Noah. Abraham, who appears at this time to have had great authority and power, was nevertheless inferior to Melchizedek, as to the office he filled in the church, from whom these visitors came with an extraordinary mission from the oracle at Salem to Sodom.

The error arises from the last proposition *וְנָתַתָּהּ* *neednah*, which in the common version is rendered, *that we may know them*; for as there is not a subjunctive mood in Hebrew, the word *may*, cannot be allowed; it subverts the true meaning of the text. This word *נָתַתָּהּ* *neednah*, which is rendered *know*, is translated variously, by which any thing is made known; as, *know, conscious, understand, direct, detect*, &c. Prov. x. 9, *he that perverteth his ways shall be known* (detected); Psa. lxxvii. 19, *thy footsteps are not known* (detected). It refers to the mission on which these two messengers came, in order to put an end to idolatry; but who were assailed by the enthusiastic idolaters of Sodom, who did not say as is said in the vulgar version, *That we may know them*, but, *We will detect them*. Thus they were determined to put them to death, in defence of their religion. Religious bigotry has been the same in all ages; but persecution has nothing to do with the spirit of the Redeemer. We have his decided disapprobation concerning any thing of the kind, Matt. xxvi. 52, *Put up again thy sword into its place, for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword*.

8. Behold now, I have two daughters. How strange it is, and how inconsistent with the feeling of a father, to suppose, as has been supposed by commentators to the present day, that the regard of a father for a stranger, should carry him so far beyond the bounds of natural affection, as to induce him to prostitute his daughters. Many ingenious arguments have been advanced to shew the great hospitality of Lot; but as human nature was the same then as now, if such men had made an appeal to their own feelings as fathers, they would not have advanced any thing in support of such a view of the subject. For, supposing it had been true it would only have shewn, that

deal worse with thee, than them: for they had pressed on the man, on Lot, exceedingly; and they came near to break the door.

10 But the men put forth their hand, and brought Lot to them, into the house: and shut the door.

11 For the men who were at the door of the house, they reproved, because of blindness; both small and great: till they loathed to find the door.

12 Now the men had said to Lot, Who *are* near to thee here? of affinity with thy sons, and with thy daughters; yea all that thou hast in the city: go forth from the place.

13 For we are destroyers, of this place; because great is the cry of them, in the presence of JEHOVAH; yea JEHOVAH hath sent us, to destroy it.

14 Then Lot went forth and spake to his

the man who could deliberately deliver his daughters to be ruined, must have been guilty of a vile act, which no enthusiastic hospitality could palliate.

Already were some of the daughters of Lot married to these idolaters, ver. 14, which of itself shews a degree of approbation as to their idolatrous profession, in allowing them thus to form a family connexion with persons so opposing the true worship of God; supposing it were done with the consent of Lot, which does not appear to have been the case. But two remained unmarried; and it appears that Lot having opened a tabernacle, where he preached the knowledge of the true God, in opposition to the idolatry of this people, he had refused his consent to any farther union with them. However, rather than suffer the strangers to be murdered, which was the intention of the mob, he offers, in order to pacify them, to give his two daughters for wives to the idol worshippers, as appears from the words, *do ye to them as it seemeth good in your eyes*. But had Lot meant that his daughters were to have been given up in the abominable sense in which it has been understood, it could not have appeared good, in their eyes; for as they had children themselves, it could not have appeared good in their estimation to have prostituted their own children. Therefore the act which must have appeared evil, even in the eyes of these men, as to their own children, could not have appeared good as it respected the children of other people. Hence it is clear, as they were satisfied with their idol worship, that this was what Lot meant when he said, *Do ye to them as it seemeth good in your eyes*.

Now as it had seemed good in their eyes, to take the daughters of Lot, and to form a connexion with his family; so it appears they had till this period, solicited Lot in vain to allow his other daughters to be married to the idolaters of Sodom.

11. And they smote the men, &c. This has been understood to mean, that the men, both small and great were literally deprived of external sight, by these two messengers putting forth their hand. Objectors say, "Had such a miracle been done as that of the people being smitten with blindness, both small and great, it surely must have convinced all the people of the city that these men were holy men, that they performed such miracles by the power

relatives, who took his daughters, and he said, Arise ye, go forth from this place; for JEHOVAH will destroy the city: but he was as a trifler, in the eyes of his relatives.

15 Now as the dawn ascended, then the messengers went forth with Lot, saying: Arise, take thy wife and thy two daughters, whom thou hast found; lest thou be consumed, in the iniquity of the city.

16 But he delayed himself, then the men seized on his hand, also on the hand of his wife, and on the hand of his two daughters; for JEHOVAH had compassion on him: thus they brought him forth, and led him, to the outside of the city.

17 Now it was as they had brought them to the outer part, that he said, Escape for thy life, thou shalt not regard thy posterity; more-

of God, and that they themselves were wrong in worshipping idols. There is also another objection to this statement in the common version, for it is said, *they wearied themselves to find the door*. But it must be evident that there would have been no difficulty in their finding the door of the house, as they were pressing upon Lot at the very door, when the men pulled him into the house.

Had the people been determined to have done to Lot, as is signified in the common version, they would have had an opportunity of doing it; for we find that immediately after, ver. 12, Lot went out to speak to his sons-in-law unrequested. If it should be said, that these men who surrounded the house, could not see him, the answer would be; but the other inhabitants of Sodom would have been ready to have supported their brethren, and to have punished him for being the cause of their blindness, unless they had all been made blind."

The word *סמך* *samerim*, which has been rendered to mean external blindness, comes from *סמר* *samer*: it is so translated only in one place, except this, in all the scripture; viz. 2 Kings vi. 18. In neither of these places, however, can it possibly mean literal blindness. If it be recollected that in this chapter of Kings, the great host of the king of Syria had surrounded the city of Dothan, it could not be that this mighty army should all be struck with external blindness! for as it is said in the 19th verse, that they who were strangers, were to follow the prophet to Samaria, even the whole army, it was not possible that they could have found their way with such an immense multitude of horses and chariots had this been the case. The word which properly means blindness is *גער* *guer*: 2 Kings xxv. 7, *put out the eyes*; Exod. iv. 11;—xix. 14;—xxi. 18; Deut. xxvii. 18. The word before us therefore in this chapter of Genesis, with a *beth* prefixed, which with this construction means *because of*, can only refer to ignorance, as not knowing the truth; and in Kings, as being ignorant of the way to Samaria.

The word *חכיו* *hikou*, in this verse, which is rendered, *they smote*, is also applied by the sacred writers to the mind. See Prov. xv. 13;—xvii. 22;—xviii. 14. And according to the idiom of the verb, it should be rendered by a word which can be applied to an ignorant or blind state of the understanding; such as that they were *smitten*, being *reproved* by these men,

over thou shalt not stand in all the plain: escape to the mountain, or thou wilt be consumed.

18 Then Lot said to them, Not now my lord.

19 Behold I pray thee, thy servant hath found favour, in thy sight, for thou wilt magnify thy mercy which thou shewest to me; in saving my life: but I cannot escape to the mountain; because some evil will overtake me, then I die.

20 Behold I pray thee this city is near to flee thither, and it is little; I will escape now thither, it is of no account, then my soul shall live.

21 And he said to him; Behold I have accepted thy person, concerning this matter also; for I will not overthrow this city, of which thou hast spoken.

22 Hasten, escape thither, for I am not able to bring forth the thing, till thy coming

who convinced them of their authority from the government at Salem, in civil, as well as in ecclesiastical affairs. This was the order of the patriarchal government at this period, which extended its authority to these cities. For it appears that Lot was legally constituted a judge; consequently he was so constituted by the government at Salem, otherwise he could not have sat in the gate of the city, as a judge, ver. 2, 9, for among the eastern nations none but the judges sat in the gates of the cities. - See above.

The verb *נאץ* *va yila'u*, is rendered in the common version, *So that they wearied themselves*; but it is not in the Hithpael conjugation, as the translators have put it, and therefore cannot be so translated. It means to *lothe*, *hate*, *faint*, to be *weary in mind*, and so to *desist*; *sorrow of mind*, 2 Sam. xiv. 10; Isa. lvi. 2; Psa. cii. 4. Those who are in an opposing state of mind. See Psa. xxxv. 15, where the plural absolute *נאצו* *neakim*, is improperly rendered *abjects*; but which should be rendered by *reprovers*; and which then agrees with the following verse, viz. *With hypocritical mockers in feasts, they gnash upon me with their teeth*.

נאצו *honto*, which is rendered *to find*, means, agreeably to the idiom of the verb, *to take hold of*, Psa. cxvi. 3, 7, 9; *to come upon*, 2 Kings vii. 9.

Now it is obvious, when all the circumstances are put together, the charge of a crime which had no existence among them; the absurdity of supposing that a father, a holy man, would prostitute his children for two strangers; and lastly, a great assembly of people struck with blindness, that they might not find the door of a house; a thing so unworthy of the sacred character of the Divine Being, by whose command these messengers were sent to inform these idolaters; I say it is sufficiently evident from these things, together with the literal meaning of the original words as used in other parts of scripture, that the sacred writer did not communicate any of the things mentioned in the common version; and that these errors are to be attributed to those who first attempted to give a translation from the original Hebrew into the Greek and Latin languages, in the early ages of the Christian church; whose translations, with all their errors, have been the standard of the European translations to the present day.

thither: therefore he called the name of the city, Zoar.

23 The sun went forth upon the earth; when Lot entered Zoar.

24 Then JEHOVAH caused rain upon Sodom, and upon Gomorrah, sulphur and fire: even JEHOVAH from the heaven.

25 So he overthrew the cities of the god; even

24. *Then the Lord rained brimstone and fire from the Lord.* In this passage we have two Lords introduced in the common version; viz. *then the Lord rained from the Lord.* This however cannot be admitted, because it is expressly said, *Hear, O Israel, Jehovah our God, is one.* And notwithstanding this plain declaration, that God is one, and no more, comment upon comment has been given to prove, that one Lord, or one JEHOVAH, was on the earth at that time, who conversed with Abraham; and that he called for brimstone and fire from the other JEHOVAH, who was in heaven. It is not my wish to expose these commentators, it would answer no good end; I believe them to be good men, who wrote from the best motives; they have been guided by the common version.

This error has arisen from the improper translation of *meeth*: it is a compound word; of *me eth*, and *mem*. The *me eth*, is properly rendered by the article *the*, viz. *the Lord*, or, *the Jehovah*. But there is no occasion for the article *the*, prefixed to the word *Jehovah*. The *mem*, which is rendered by *from*, viz. *from the Lord*, or *from the Jehovah*, is explanatory, when the same noun is repeated; or when a noun immediately follows, which contains, or comprehends, the same noun. See Jud. xvii. 8, which should be rendered, *and the man departed from the city, even Bethlehem.* Which meaning, with a similar construction, is comprehended by *me eth*, see 2 Kings, xiii. 16, *eth kaal dibree, even all the words.* So that *even*, in this verse of Kings, should not be in italics, as it is in some bibles. The last clause reads, *even Jehovah from the heaven.*

25. *And he overthrew those cities.* But the *me eth*, or the *me ha*, prefixed to *meeth* *guarim*, cities, cannot be translated by the pronoun plural *those*. And the word *me el*, is entirely omitted, which is one of the most important words in the verse; as it shews us what crime it was for which these cities were destroyed. This word throughout the scripture means, a god—supreme power. Thus we learn, that the inhabitants of these cities attributed supreme power to the idol they worshipped. See where the same word means God, Gen. xiv. 12; —xxx. 13; Deut. vii. 9, &c. &c. &c. too numerous for insertion. See also on ver. 8. Hence it is obvious, that the crime which the inhabitants of these cities were guilty of was the crime of the most gross idolatry; in worshipping the idol as the only god of supreme power; and not the abominable crime attributed to them by commentators.

26. *But his wife looked back from behind him.* Objectors, ever since the dispersion of the Jews, or rather from the time when the first translations were made, have always brought forward this part of the narrative, as it now unfortunately stands in all the European versions, to invalidate the truths of the sacred scriptures; and we find that the arguments of the old skeptics have been strengthened by the writings of modern infidels. We are told, that "the case of the wife of Lot was a very hard one—that it was natural for any of the family to look back on the city where they had relatives, even two daughters married—that there could be nothing criminal in this,

on all the plain: yea even all the inhabitants of the cities; also the produce of the ground.

26 But his wife looked after his posterity; and she became a memorial of destruction.

27 Then Abraham rose, early in the morning, because of the place; when he stood there, before the face of JEHOVAH.

28 And he looked to the front of Sodom, and

so long as they were obedient in quitting the city—and where was the necessity for an order, so apparently trifling, and so truly unworthy of being a command of God?"

These remarks have been made with much propriety and effect; but as the passage in the common version is obviously opposed to the original, we shall find, when truly translated, that it does not convey any thing so inconsistent with reason.

The word *meeth* *meeth*, is rendered, *from behind him*: but this rendering is not applicable to the transaction; if this had been the case, the sacred writer would have said, *she looked back*. It evidently refers to the posterity of Lot, who were left in the city. See 1 Kings, xvi. 3, where the word has this meaning; also ch. xxi. 21; Dan. xi. 4; and which with the *mem* prefixed, i. e. *after*; and the masculine pronoun postfixed, reads, *after his posterity*. That is, returned to the city, to her children she had left there.

If commentators had given themselves time to examine this subject, surely they would have found that the demand for these strangers was not for the wicked purpose which has been supposed by them; and that for this conclusive reason: Lot was a stranger, yet they had treated him as a friend, and had given him and his children a settlement among them. Had they been a people of the description supposed, Lot, as well as all strangers who passed through these cities, must have been treated in like manner. It was a crime I believe never heard of until the translators made this unpardonable blunder. But as in other scriptures they have given a disgusting sense, which the sacred writer never intended to convey, by saying, Lev. xvii. 7, *They have gone a whoring*; Ps. lxxiii. 27, *That go a whoring from thee—Whorish heart*; Hos. iv. 12, *They have gone a whoring from under their God*; and other passages improper to mention; so they have done concerning the passage under consideration. Such vulgar and indelicate expressions most imperiously call for a revision of the scriptures. Surely when such passages are read, even by those who are weak enough to say, "the very errors are consecrated"—and others which the licentious, believing the scripture to be of divine origin, would blush even to mention, it ought to awaken that laudable feeling for the credit of the Bible, and of its religion, which has in a great degree slept, in obedience to councils and decrees, ever since the errors were made by the first translators in the second century; copied by Jerome in the fourth; and circulated by that contaminated European fountain, the Vulgate, from whence all the European translations have been made. Had the translators also remembered that some of the daughters of Lot were married among this people; nothing of the nature alluded to could have been attributed to the inhabitants of Sodom.

26. *And she became a pillar of salt.* We cannot entertain a single doubt respecting the certainty of this awful visitation; proofs of which, at this remote period, are before the eyes of the whole world. For the plain of Jordan, where these cities were built, was one of the most fertile places in the east; it is said to have been, like the garden of God, Gen. xiii. 10.

Gomorrhah, and to all the face of the land of the plain; which he saw, and behold, the smoke of the land ascended; like the smoke, of a furnace.

29 Now it was, when God destroyed the cities

But to this day it bears visible marks of the divine displeasure: it is the most barren land in all the east. Both ancient and modern historians give testimony to the present unproductive state of this once fertile country.

Diodorus Siculus informs us, that the nature of the lakes which cover the site where these cities stood, is of such a nature, that fish are not able to live in them. Hist. l. p. 734. Strabo describes the lake Asphaltis, and says, that there were thirteen cities situated in the plain of the Jordan, which were all destroyed by an inundation of burning sulphur. Georg. lib. 16.

Tacitus also says that these cities were destroyed by lightning: the earth was burnt, and all its vegetable powers destroyed. Hist. lib. c. 7.

Mr. Maundrell visited these lakes in the year 1697; and he observes; "being desirous of seeing the remains, if there were any, of those cities anciently situate in this place, and made so dreadful an example of Divine vengeance; I diligently surveyed the waters, as far as my eye could reach; but I could not discern any heaps of ruins, nor any smoke ascending, as is usually described in the maps of geographers. But the father guardian, and the procurator of Jerusalem, declared to me, that they had seen some of these ruins near the shore, when the waters were shallow; that they went and found there some pillars, and other parts of buildings." Travels, p. 85.

Thevenot confirms the above authorities: he says, "There is no fish in this sea, because of the great saltness. The land within three leagues round is not cultivated, but is white and mingled with salt and ashes. In short, we must think there is a heavy curse of God upon this place, seeing it was so pleasant a country." Travels, vol. i. p. 194.

It appears from the same record, that the destruction was not only brought on these people by sulphureous lightning, but that they were overturned by an earthquake; for not a vestige remains above the ground; they were swallowed, and yet the remains, though covered, were left to convince posterity of the certainty of this fact as contained in the scriptures.

Nevertheless, though these cities were destroyed, and the people for their wickedness, there is no ground either in scripture or reason, for believing that the wife of Lot was turned into a pillar of salt. Had she been turned into salt, it would have required a perpetual miracle to have preserved this monument; for salt, whether alkaline, neutral, or acid, is soluble by water, and therefore it could not long have remained in the form of a pillar, to convince posterity, as many weak people have supposed, that she was thus punished for her disobedience. Commentators of this description have done more injury to the religion of the Bible than all the atheists and deists in the world, though they have interlarded their comments on this subject with the monkish interpolation of Josephus, who is made to say, that pillar of salt was in existence in his day, Antiq. c. xi. sec. 4. I say monkish interpolation, for the reader will recollect, that at this early period of the Christian church, all MSS. having relation to the scriptures were carried down by the mighty flood of bigotry and superstition; additions, alterations, and explanations, were foisted into the trans-

of the plain, that God remembered, Abraham: and he sent Lot from the midst of the overthrow, when he overthrew the cities, in which Lot dwelt.

30 Then Lot ascended from Zoar, and he

lations, to suit the craft and policy of designing men. Certainly a moment's consideration will convince any man, that a pillar of any species of salt could not have continued visible nearly 2000 years, from Abraham to the time of Josephus. No travellers, however, since the Christian dispensation, have ever met with this pillar.

Agreeably to scripture, I mean to the true and obvious sense of the original Hebrew, there is no authority for supposing that the sacred writer entertained such an opinion; neither did the patriarchs from Abraham to his time, who resided in that part of the country, and who, no doubt, would have told us of it, had any thing of this nature taken place.

The word מֶלַח *melach*, which signifies salt, is also, on account of its being alone indestructible in its nature, used in the scriptures as an emblem of immortality and perpetual desolation: see Numb. xviii. 19; a covenant of salt for ever, i. e. a statute for ever, 2 Chron. xiii. 5. And as a symbol of perpetual desolation, Jud. ix. 45, beat down the city and sowed it with salt; Ezek. xlvii. 11, they shall be given to salt. Not that the covenant was salt, or the land should become salt, or that sowing salt in the city should make it desolate; but it is used as a figure, comprehending a representation of something eternal like itself. For the nature of salt is wonderful; it is not in the power of fire to destroy it; even the action of fermentation, which changes every other substance in nature, has no effect on salt, it remains the same after it has passed through the body: therefore properly used as a figure of whatever approaches to its final and eternal state. This is evidently the sense in which the word *melach* is used by the sacred writer in this passage, as it is in the above, and in every other part of the Bible where this word occurs, and the final state of any thing is mentioned metaphorically. For it must be allowed, that whenever a metaphor is used, and the thing to which it is applied cannot remain, be, or exist in a natural or visible state, as is shewn above, in salts exposed to the elements, which necessarily are soon dissolved; then the word is applicable to an use which in its original import it cannot be put.

This word מֶלַח *melach*, primarily means to dissolve, to melt, Isa. li. 6. The heavens נִמְלָאֲחוּ *nimlaachou*, shall be dissolved. Symmachus renders it αλισσυσιν, shall melt like salt; the Vulgate *liquefcent, shall melt*, so as not to be seen. This is one of the properties of salts, all which dissolve in water so as not to be seen in it. I therefore render the word *melach* agreeably to its primary signification, meaning the final end of the thing spoken of, by the word destruction.

The word מִצֵּיִת *mitsit*, is rendered a pillar. But it is not here applied to mean a pillar; it signifies to establish finally; and so it is used to mean the establishing of a kingdom, 1 Chron. xviii. 3; Isa. vi. 13; to the word or promise of God, as being established, fixed, settled, to stand by way of a memorial, Psa. xxxix. 5. Thus it was recorded, as a memorial, that the wife of Lot chose to abide with the unbelievers, of the posterity of Lot, among the idolaters, rather than quit it to reside with the worshippers of God.

27. And Abraham gat up. Hebrew, Then Abraham arose, וַיָּשָׁם *yishcem*, is not a compound word.

dwelt in a mountain, also both his daughters with him; for he feared to dwell in Zoar: and he dwelt in a cave, he and both his daughters.

31 Now the firstborn said to the younger, Our father is old; moreover not a man is in the

To the place where he stood before the Lord. That is, to the place where it was the custom for the priest to stand in the presence of God, in the holy-place, to inquire.

30 to 36. This statement of the conduct of the daughters of Lot, in all the translations, is not only inconsistent, but contrary to the true translation of the Hebrew.

Lot was a priest of the ancient church which was established by Noah, had been instructed by Abraham, and to this advanced period of his life taught the worship of the God of heaven in opposition to the worship of the idols of the land. His daughters had also been brought up agreeably to the precepts given to Noah, which solemnly denounced any thing of an immoral tendency; but particularly crimes of the horrid and disgusting cast imputed to them through the errors of the early translators.

The narrative is also inconsistent with the possibility of nature; for Lot is said to be an *old man*; that one night the first-born conceived, and that the next night the younger conceived also; and this while he was in a state of drunkenness, altogether incapable of knowing what he did. But a little reflection would have convinced the translators, that this was not as related in the vulgar version.

The reader will remember that these two daughters of Lot had been offered to be given in marriage by him to the idolaters of Sodom, where his other daughters were married among that people. And as they had left the city of Sodom, and had taken up their abode near the city of Zoar, there can be no doubt but that both of them were married here, to the idolaters of this city, without the consent or knowledge of their father: a crime in those patriarchal ages scarcely ever forgiven.

And dwell in the mountain. But his simply abiding in the mountain could have been no security to him; therefore from the whole tenor of the narrative it appears (as has been observed) that every other profession of religion was excluded from the cities of this people. And when we recollect that in all the patriarchal churches their places of worship were upon mountains, it will also appear that Lot at this time retired to a place of worship on a mountain not far from Zoar, where he dwelt in a meadow, for in the word *בנגוארא* *bangnaarah* means. See ch. ix. 33, MEADOWS of Gibeon.

Commentators have not given a true statement concerning Lot, and of his situation at this place. They have supposed that he lived here in a solitary *cave* or *den*, with his daughters only. But the absurdity of this conclusion must be obvious. In such a den as he is represented to have fled to, he certainly could not have found any accommodation, neither could he have procured the necessaries of life: from which it will be seen, that Lot must have retired to a place where he could be provided with the necessaries of life, otherwise where was this wine, here spoken of, to have been had? The meadow, or glebe-land of the tabernacle, therefore, on this mountain, appears to have been the place to which Lot retired, where the worship of God was observed agreeably to the dispensation given to Noah, but which was excluded from Zoar.

And here it was that at the evening oblation the daughters of

land, to come to us, as is the custom, of all the land.

32 Therefore we will drink wine, with our father, then we will abide from him: thus we shall preserve posterity, after our father.

Lot contrived successively to leave their father, and to marry among those who could come in unto them with the customs and privileges of the land, even as their sisters had already been married, ver. 14. It may be supposed however that they were destroyed in Sodom; but this does not appear; they might, after they saw Lot depart, have left also.

Having shewn, consistently with that underiating rule of right reason by which the sacred scriptures are written, that the narrative, as it stands in all the translations, is not a statement of the real facts respecting Lot and his daughters; I shall now proceed to shew, that nothing of the abominable nature, so long held forth by commentators, can possibly be understood from the original: and that the error is chargeable on the translators, who have put words into the text of the common versions, for which it will be seen there is not any authority in the original Hebrew.

The 31st verse says, *our father is old*. *יְרֵאָה* *yeareah*, means a very old man; and from this expression we may conclude, that no prevailing opposition would be made to their marriage, after what had taken place at Sodom, where the other daughters of Lot were married to the idolaters. The latter part of this verse is important, viz. *there is not a man in the earth to come in unto us after the manner of all the earth*. That is, there was not a man in the land where they had chosen their residence, not a man who was a worshipper of the true God, who could invest them with the privileges of the people of the land. So it appears that religious bigotry is the same in all ages; none could enjoy the privileges of the laws of the land, but the idolaters, who here governed the country. And therefore it is said, *Lot feared to dwell in Zoar*; viz. they were here such bigots to this abomination, that he feared to dwell there as a preacher of the true God; and it was one of the cities which would have been destroyed, had he not earnestly solicited to have it spared, ver. 20.

There is not a man in the earth. The words *יְרֵאָה* *baarets*, in the earth, evidently mean, in the land; as it is so translated in other parts of scripture; viz. not a man in the land of these idolaters, who could marry them agreeably to their own profession of the true worship, and invest them with the privileges of the people of the land, as above.

All the earth, viz. the land; which land was the land under the government of the king of Zoar. This will appear evident, when we know that there were people in the city of Zoar, who could have come in unto them with the customs of their own profession, viz. with the privileges consequent on embracing idolatry. That which also confirms this is, that the son of the firstborn, Moab, was the father of the Moabites; and the son of the younger, was the father of the Ammonites, those notorious idolaters, four hundred years after this period, in the time of Moses.

32. *Come let us make our father drink wine.* The verb *נָשָׂא* *nishak*, is rendered, *let us make—drink*. But the obvious translation is, *we will drink*: and then the word *נָשָׂא* *eth*, which is omitted in the common version, has its reading, viz. *we will drink wine, נָשָׂא* *eth*; with our father.

And we will lie with him. The word *נָשָׂא* *gimmo*, is ren-

33 So they drank wine, with their father that same night: when the firstborn went where

dered, *with him*. The literal rendering with this construction is, *from*, viz. from him, or away from him. See the following verses, 34, 35.

That is, as wine was offered by the idolaters, so they concluded to join them in their worship; and as a proof of their sincerity, to partake of their libations, *unknown to their father*, as their sisters had done in Sodom, who were married there; and yet to keep up a semblance of their still continuing in the true worship, they would also drink of the evening oblation, when their father offered the evening sacrifice.

33. *They made their father drink wine that night*. It will be recollected, that agreeably to the dispensations in all the patriarchal churches, the oblations were offered every evening, when the *wine offering* was poured out in the sanctuary; for we are not to suppose that all the people in this part were idolaters: there were some who worshipped agreeably to the ancient institution. But on this account, if they resided in the jurisdiction of Zoar, they appear to have been in great personal danger; they were stigmatized with the term *sectarist*, and *heretic*, and not permitted to worship God among these worshippers of images. And for this reason it is said, *there was not a man in all the land to come in unto them, after the manner of all the land*; literally, *with the custom of all the land*, as above. The apostle alluded to this kind of oppression which was to take place under some direful hierarchy, when he said, Rev. xiii. 17. *And that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name*.

And lay with her father. On reading this passage every individual must necessarily feel that disgust which is impossible for all the powers of language to describe. What! the hoary-headed patriarch, who was a priest after the order of Melchizedek, and a continual opposer of the idolaters, guilty of such an abomination! I am almost at a loss to conclude, who have been the most to blame: the original translators in the early age of the christian church, who first made this unpardonable blunder; or the translators and commentators since that period, who have implicitly followed them, without either considering the *impossibility of the thing*, or of critically examining the narrative in the original. When we consider that this statement has been held forth for so many ages as done by a *patriarch—a holy man—a very old man*; particularly called with Abraham to establish the worship of God; one of the most astonishing considerations is, that the scriptures during this long period have been preserved from oblivion, and have been deemed sacred in the eyes of Europe to the present day. It can be attributed to nothing less than to that divine power which, in the never ceasing procedure of his watchful providence, has protected these sacred oracles agreeably to his word.

This appears evidently to have been an agreement between the two sisters to marry among the idolaters in Zoar, as their sisters had done among the idolaters in Sodom; but without the knowledge of their father. And for this express purpose the firstborn, who agreeably to the custom was to be married first, went from the dwelling of her father, and returned to give her sister the same opportunity. The word *וַיִּשְׁכַּב* *va shiskab*, is rendered, *and lay*, but agreeably to the idiom, it means, *to remain, abide, rest, a state in life*.

But the word *וַיֵּלֶךְ* *taab*, rendered, *and went in*, is obviously wrong; the word *in*, is made a part of the text, for

she abode from her father, but he knew not where she abode, neither when she married.

which there is not any authority in the original. The *וַיִּשְׁכַּב* also, prefixed to the following verb *וַיֵּלֶךְ* *shekab*, rendered, *and lay*, is adverbial; referring to place, as in other parts of scripture, see Job xxiii. 3. This passage then assumes a different appearance; she did not go in to her father, but she left the house of her father, *where she abode till she was married among the idolaters of Zoar*; and thus followed the example of her sisters, who also had been married without the knowledge or consent of their father; for he being a worshipper of the true God, could not countenance an union of this description.

34. *And it came to pass on the morrow*. This is not the true meaning of the word *וַיָּבֹאוּ* *mimaacharuth*; it signifies an indefinite time, viz. *at a future time*, see Gen. xxx. 39; Exod. xiii. 14; Deut. vi. 20, &c. *in time to come*.

Yesternight. Neither can *וַיָּבֹאוּ* *emesh* have this meaning: for as the former word relates to future time, so this has relation to time past. Job xxx. 3. Heb. *in former time*.

With him. *וְעִמּוֹ* *gnimo*, is translated *with him*, but it should be remembered that this word is applied in various senses, agreeably to the intention of the writer, the tenor of the narrative, and the possibility of the thing in question. Now if we find in the investigation of any subject that the things mentioned were impossible to be accomplished, as in the case before us, it must appear evident that they never entered into the mind of the sacred writer, and that this word cannot have the meaning here given to it by the translators. Consistently with universal grammar, when the narrative conveys an idea of a succession of state, circumstances, or things, then the preposition should carry with it such a signification. Now as this is evidently the case here, as the second daughter of Lot was now passing from a single to a married state, *וְעִמּוֹ*, rendered improperly by *with*, calls for its corresponding word in other languages. I have therefore rendered it as it is rendered in Dan. iv. 3, by *from*; which, as it is connected with the masculine pronoun postfixed, reads, *from him*.

When she lay down. It certainly does not require both a verb, and an adverb, to explain the meaning of *וַיִּשְׁכַּב* *te shiklah*, as in the common version. It truly signifies *to rest, to lodge*. Josh. ii. 1, and *lodged there*.

Nor when she arose. It will be remembered that in all the churches before the christian church, when a woman, being in her father's house, bound herself by a vow to perform any thing; if her father disallowed it in the day that he heard of it, it did not stand; Numb. xxx. 3, 4, 5. Now as Lot was averse to his daughters forming any connexion with the idolaters, it appears that this was unknown to him.

וַיִּכְרְמוּ *Vukhoumah*, is rendered, *nor when she arose*. Here we have described in the common version a state of complete stupefaction, by drunkenness; a state altogether incapable of thought, or action.

וַיִּכְרְמוּ *Komah*, which with its prefixes is rendered, *nor when she arose*, is a word of very extensive application; and is capable of various modes of expression, as is the case with words in all languages. And it should be translated, not only as it is in other parts of scripture, but also consistently with the obvious sense of the narrative, which is, that the daughters of Lot had now determined to form a connexion, and to settle themselves among the idolaters, as their sisters had already done.

The various modes by which a verb is expressed agreeably

34 Now it was in after time, that the first-born said to the younger; Behold, I abode in time past, from my father: we will drink wine also this night, then go abide from him; thus we shall preserve posterity after our father.

35 Then they drank wine also that night, with their father: and the younger married, and abode from him; but he knew not where she abode, neither when she married.

36 Thus both the daughters of Lot conceived, unknown to their father.

37 Then the firstborn bare a son; and she called his name Moab: he is the father of Moab, to this day.

to the idea of the writer or speaker, are many in all languages. Thus it is said of a person who rises in the world, as to property or situation, that he is *established, stands, remains, subsists, continues, endures, maintains, withstands, justified, absolved, succeeds*. And with regard to the operation of any purpose, counsel, word, doctrine, prediction, promise, decree, decision, vow, agreement, or bargain; it means, to stand good, to be ratified, established, confirmed, made sure, performed. Gen. xvii. 13, *arise*; Deut. xix. 15, *established*; Josh. ii. 11, *remain*; 1 Sam. xiii. 14, *continue*; Jer. xlv. 29, *shall stand*; Gen. vii. 4, *that subsisteth*; Prov. xv. 22, *established*; Gen. xxiii. 17, *made sure*; Num. xxx. 4, *every bond shall stand*. And consequently this word in the strictest sense embraces the act of marriage. For when a woman is married, she is then *established: the bond, vow, or bargain is made sure; is ratified and confirmed*. Therefore the above sense and application of the word I have chosen, most necessarily be allowed; for it appears that the translators did not attend to the whole narrative in the Hebrew, but have followed the translation of the first translator after the dispersion of the Jews, who did not understand the Hebrew; and thus the stream from the Hebrew fountain has been poisoned on its first breaking forth. The modern Septuagint, and the Vulgate, where this error was first made, have been implicitly followed by all the European translators.

36. Thus were both the daughters of Lot with child by their father. The whole meaning and application of this verse entirely depend on the translation of the *mem*, prefixed to אביהן *abihem, their father*; which reads, *by their father*, as it stands in the common version. Of all the particles to which *mem*, corresponds, there is not one so improper here, as the word *by*. The true and primary meaning of this preposition is, *from*, Gen. ii. 2; Ezek. vii. 26; Prov. xx. 3; Isa. lvi. 11, *out of*; Gen. xv. 4; Jud. xi. 36, *without*; Job xi. 15; —xxi. 19; Mich. iii. 6, *without a vision*, viz. that which is unknown. I therefore render the *mem*, as it is in the above passages, for the words *from*, and *without*, have an agreement; whatever is taken *from* a subject, leaves that subject of course *without* it.

The necessity for this secrecy will also be obvious, when we remember (as above) that if while the daughter remained in her father's house, he knew her intention respecting her vow, and were silent, then the thing so vowed stood in law; but if he disapproved it could not stand. Therefore in order to avoid this denial, which they knew would be the case if their father

88 And the younger also bare a son; and she called his name, Ben-ammi: he is the father of the children of Ammon, to this day.

CHAP. XX.

NOW Abraham had journeyed thence, to the land of the south, where he dwelt between Kadesh, and Shur: and he sojourned in Gerar.

2 Moreover Abraham said, concerning Sarah his wife, She is my sister: and Abimelech king of Gerar, sent, and took Sarah.

3 But God came to Abimelech, in a dream by night, and he said to him, Behold thou shalt

were to hear of their design, to secure their marriage with the idolaters of Zoar, it was kept a secret from him.

Some may ask, how could the Jews be deceived as to their language? would they not have detected this error? I would observe, that the Jews have no advantage above the Christians in acquiring a knowledge of the language; had they, surely before this day it would have been shewn, that all those palpable contradictions and inconsistencies which disgrace the translations, are not to be found in the original; it would have advanced the credit of the Jewish, as well as the Christian religion. But indeed the far greater part of the Jews in all nations, though they pronounce the Hebrew, or read the Hebrew Bible, yet they know not the meaning; and are obliged to gain their knowledge of the original from the national translations.

I say, it appears that the early translators did not attend to the whole narrative, which states that the country was under the sole dominion of the idolaters. Lot was afraid to dwell in Zoar, and the worshippers of God, agreeably to the divine ordination, were excluded and persecuted: otherwise they could not have stained the sacred character of the venerable patriarch with crimes; of the holy man, who was, in his official capacity under that dispensation, in the constant habit of receiving the divine communication from above the Cherubim; and of his daughters, who had been brought up in pure morality, with crimes, which are, and ever will be detested by the most abandoned.

The impossibility on the one hand, and the circumstances and facts on the other, with the children being brought up as idolaters, and which would not have been the case unless the daughters of Lot had married among the idolaters—I say, all these circumstances and things, together with the literal meaning of the words in the original, confirmed by other parts of scripture where the same are found, and which can have no other meaning, agreeably to the rational and true sense of the narrative; sufficiently prove that the new translation is perfectly consistent with the meaning of the sacred writer.

NOTES ON CHAP. XX.

Ver. 2. This appears to have been one of the journeys of Abraham soon after he came from Ur of the Chaldees, at which period Sarah was in the bloom of life, and very beautiful. Therefore Abraham said, *she is my sister*. And we find that the king of the country took her, and she was placed in the house allotted for such as were to live in the royal palace,

die, because of the woman whom thou hast taken; for this same lord is her husband.

4 Nevertheless Abimelech had not approached to her: and he said, Lord, wilt thou therefore slay a righteous nation?

5 Said he not to me, She is my sister? yea even also she herself said, He is my brother: from uprightness of heart in me, and with innocency of hands, I have done this.

6 Then God said to him in a dream, Moreover I have known, that in the uprightness of thy heart, thou hast done this; but I restrained thee, yea I prevented thee from sinning against me: for this reason I suffered thee not, to draw near to her.

7 Therefore now return the wife of the man, for he is a prophet, and he shall pray for thee, then live: but if thou restore not; know that thou shalt surely die, thou, and all who are with thee.

8 When Abimelech rose in the morning, then he called for all his servants, and mentioned all these words, in their ears: and the men feared, exceedingly.

after they had fulfilled the time of their probation; which was about three or four months. But God informed Abimelech in a dream that she was the wife of Abraham, that he was a prophet, and commanded him to restore her to her husband. The king excused himself by saying that Abraham had declared her to be his sister, and that she herself had said *he is my brother*. Objectors universally, and even some commentators, have said, that Abraham and Sarah told a wilful lie. It was however a truth, and I would caution commentators particularly to be more careful, as no good can possibly arise by indulging in such bold and unscriptural assertions. In the 12th verse he fully acquits himself of the charge of having said any thing contrary to the literal truth: he says, *and yet indeed she is my sister, she is the daughter of my father, but not the daughter of my mother*.

14. From the authorized version, we understand that Abimelech, as soon as he found that Abraham justified himself, took sheep, and oxen, and men-servants, and women-servants, and gave them unto Abraham, and restored Sarah. But there is not any authority for this translation in the original; we do not find that there was any consideration given on the part of Abraham for all this profusion of valuable property. It was not enough that Abimelech should restore his wife to him, which was all he expected, but he must, in addition to all the above mentioned property, give him a thousand of silver, and all this to a stranger. Aben Ezra supposes, that all this property was to make a compensation to Abraham for the insult offered him in taking Sarah, that others might be convinced he was culpable, and that this conduct of his was to be a covering of the eyes to prove her innocence. But this interpretation is contrary to the grammar of the language; for to refer the pronoun *הם* *He, he*, to the conduct of Abimelech as a covering of the eyes, is worse than referring it to the remote noun

9 Now Abimelech called for Abraham, and he said to him, What hast thou done to us? and how have I offended against thee; that thou hast brought upon me, and upon my kingdom, a great sin? the deeds which thou hast done to me; should not be done.

10 Also Abimelech said, to Abraham: What sawest thou, that thou hast done this thing?

11 Then Abraham said; Because I thought, Certainly the fear of God, is not in this place: and they will slay me, through the word of my wife.

12 And yet truly she is my sister, she is the daughter of my father, but not the daughter of my mother: and she became my wife.

13 So it was when God caused me to go, from the house of my father, that I said to her; This is thy kindness, which thou shalt do to me: at every place where we shall come; say of me, He is my brother.

14 Now Abimelech had received, sheep and oxen, and men-servants, and maidens; then he brought to Abraham, and restored to him; Sarah his wife.

וְכֶסֶף *Cheseph, silver*, which some commentators have done; and which silver was to be a covering of the eyes, to purchase her a veil to cover her beauty. But it is plain that Abimelech did not do this to insult Abraham, because he says, *in the integrity of my heart, and innocency of my hands, have I done this*. Therefore there was no ground for that profusion of gifts which the Rabbi supposed was given to Abraham. This has often been considered as a very objectionable part of scripture, because it is contrary to right reason to suppose that these transactions took place in the order in which they are related in the authorized version. Neither could Abraham, who is declared to be a prince, and the richest man in all the east, have accepted such favours, without making an adequate return for them.

We learn from scripture that the patriarchs were shepherds, and that Abraham was a shepherd king; for his riches arose from his numerous herds with which he supplied the neighbouring nations. We also learn that it was the custom to remove from place to place for pasturage. Not that Abraham wandered about without any visible way of procuring a living, a charge often made by objectors; but this was his honourable and profitable occupation. Having so far introduced the subject, I shall now briefly shew, that Abimelech gave neither sheep, nor oxen, nor men-servants, nor women-servants to Abraham.

The first word in this verse is *וַיִּקַּח* *vayikach*, which is translated, *and he took*; but this word should be translated as the same word is in Exod. xxxii. 4, *and he received*; 1 Sam. xxv. 35, *So David received*; 2 Kings xix. 14, *and Hezekiah received*; Isa. xxxvii. 14. The first clause will then read as in the new translation. So that, instead of giving all this valuable property to Abraham, a stranger, we find that Abimelech received the whole from Abraham, who gave him a thousand of silver for the same.

10 She had also said to Abraham; Expel this maiden, because of her son: for the son of this maiden cannot inherit, with my son, with Isaac.

11 And the thing was very grievous in the sight of Abraham: because of his son.

12 But God said to Abraham, It shall not be grievous in thy sight, because of the youth, and because of thy maiden; all that Sarah hath said

which the law gave her, as appears from the 10th verse, viz. *Cast out this bond-woman and her son.* There is no word in the original for *bond*; and *אמה* *amah*, means a *maiden*. Heb. *cast out this maiden.* But let it be understood, that this casting out was not, agreeably to the opinion of this day, that she was turned out to provide for herself and the youth. The word *אמה* *gaareesh*, means, to *exclude*, or *cut off*, from the succession to the *estate, or property.* And the *vav* prefixed to *אמה*, which immediately follows, assigns a reason why Ishmael should be excluded from the house, or hereditary succession. But the *אמה*, is omitted in the common version, which fixes the application; it is here to be rendered, as with the same construction in other parts of scripture, by *of*, viz. *because of her son.* Ishmael could not inherit with Isaac.

12. Isaac, according to the law of primogeniture, was the appointed branch, from whom the promised Messiah was to come: therefore it is said, *cast out this bond-woman and her son, for the son of this bond-woman shall not be heir with my son, even with Isaac.* Agreeably to ancient custom, the bond son, who is one not born in lawful wedlock, had no right to inherit, as is the case at this day in all civilized nations.

Some objectors have thought that there was a degree of cruelty in the conduct of Abraham towards Hagar, when he thus complied with the request of Sarah. But this was nothing more than what is lawful and right in the present day. Ishmael was not a child, he was at this time fourteen years old; neither does it appear that either Hagar, or Ishmael, were neglected by Abraham. It is said of Ishmael, *he dwelt in the wilderness of Paran, and his mother took him a wife out of the land of Egypt*, that was of the lineage of Hagar, who was an Egyptian. Now as Abraham was a shepherd king, and one of the richest men in all the east, there can be no doubt but that he provided sufficiently for his son Ishmael. This will appear evident if we turn to the 25th chapter of Genesis, where we find that Abraham had six sons besides Ishmael and Isaac, who were amply provided for by Abraham before his death. In the 19th and following verses, the sons of Ishmael, twelve in number, are said to be princes of the country: *These are the sons of Ishmael, and these are their names by their towns, and by their castles, twelve princes according to their nations*; which could not have been the case had they not received great riches from Abraham.

Ishmael having given countenance to the idolatry of Canaan, by marrying the daughter of an idolater, Abraham, to prevent any thing of this nature happening to his son Isaac, determined to take him a wife of his own kindred, who had not joined the gross idolatry of the age. He accordingly commissioned his confidential servant to go on that business, saying, *thou shalt not take a wife unto my son of the daughters of the Canaanites among whom I dwell, but thou shalt go unto my country, and to my kindred, and take a wife unto my son Isaac.* This being done, the dispensation which God had deigned to give to Abraham, was delivered to Isaac.

to thee, hearken to her voice: for from Isaac, shall thy posterity be called.

13 Yea also of the son of the maiden, I will make a nation: because he is thy offspring.

14 Then Abraham rose in the morning, and he took bread, and a bottle of water, which he gave to Hagar, putting it upon her shoulder, also the lad, and he sent her forth: so she

14. Much has been said by objectors against the conduct of the patriarch in taking Hagar during the life of Sarah; and they say, It was inconsistent with honour, and the religion he professed. We find however that though it was the custom of the country for a man to take a woman if his wife were past the time, and had no children; yet Abraham did not attempt it, but at the earnest solicitation of his wife, who said; *It may be I may obtain children by her.* From which we learn that when a man had no children by his wife, if he took a woman, who was to all intents and purposes his wife, by whom he had children, they were the adopted children of the wife, who treated them as her own, and they shared the patrimonial estate; which must, in case of no posterity, have gone to strangers born in the house; as we have seen ch. xv. 2, 3, where the steward of the house of Abraham, born in his house, was to be his heir. The son of the bond-woman could not inherit. Even the dowry of the wife, which was in her gift, would have passed away, had she not had posterity, legitimate, or adopted. And this was one reason, why they were anxious for their husbands to marry during their life.

Abraham took bread, and a bottle of water, &c. From this rendering some have concluded that *yeled*, rendered in the common version *child*, was put upon her shoulder, as well as the bread and the bottle of water. But *yeled*, is applied to those who were under the age of twenty years; under which age, they could not succeed to an inheritance, nor were they capable of taking up arms in defence of their country. The words *putting it on her shoulder*, even in the translation, are read in a parenthesis, and mean the bread and water only.

It appears from the history, that Ishmael at this time was about sixteen years old; he was fourteen at the birth of Isaac, and it must have been some considerable time after when this removal took place. But unless the customs and manners of these ancients be understood, many things may seem strange to us; for we find that European commentators have endeavoured to interpret agreeably to the customs of modern times. The bread and water which a woman could carry in a hot country, seem but ill calculated to support life in a journey of this description. But the fact is, that in all transactions of refusal or agreement, certain formulas were observed; when a man swore to perform a promise, he put his hand on his thigh; when a man refused to raise posterity to his brother, the woman in the presence of the elders, was to loose his shoe, and spit in his face. So when a person agreeably to contract was under a necessity of providing for another in a case of this description, he presented the party with bread and water. Thus we find a reference is made to this custom by the prophet Isaiah, xxx. 16, *bread shall be given him, his waters shall be sure.* So that nothing more nor less was understood by the bread and water being given to Hagar, than that it was a pledge, signifying that Abraham would provide for them; and we shall find that this was done in the most ample manner.

departed, and went to the wilderness, of Beer-sheba.

15 When the water in the bottle was spent, then she left the lad, because of another communication.

16 Then she went, and waited herself for

The word *וַתֵּלֶךְ* *vatelekh*, is rendered *wandered*; but a word more consistent with the sense of the passage might have been chosen; it gives the idea of passing from place to place. Whereas in the common version we are left to suppose that Hagar wandered about, lost in the wilderness. A proper word being chosen, the passage will read, in conformity with the meaning of the sacred writer, thus; *So she departed, and went into the wilderness of Beer-sheba, on her way to Paran, the place provided for her and Ishmael, according to the 21st verse.*

By the word *בְּמִדְבָּר* *bemidbar*, which is rendered *wilderness*, we are not to understand that it always means an uncultivated, or desert part of the country; in the desert, wilderness, or country of Arabia, at this day, there are populous cities, so that the wilderness of Paran, where Ishmael settled, was properly the country of Paran. From the following part of the history, we find that Abraham did not turn out the mother and son to starve, as objectors have said; but he made a provision for them, as is evident from the 6th verse of the 25th chapter, he provided for all his children, *he gave them gifts, and sent them away from Isaac.* And in the 9th verse, we see that all animosity ceased, for Ishmael assisted Isaac at the funeral of their father; he was a prince of the country, and his sons were princes also; ch. xxv. 16, *twelve princes according to their nations.*

Thus it appears that the character of the prophet has been unfairly represented by infidel writers: and I am sorry to say that I have not met with one commentator who has attempted to justify this conduct of the venerable patriarch, but have suffered him to be handed down to posterity with all those disadvantages which have been called forth to aid the cause of infidelity.

15. *And she cast the child under one of the shrubs.* From this translation, we are led to conclude that Ishmael was an infant, because it states; *that she cast the child under one of the shrubs.* But Ishmael at this time was about sixteen years old, as observed; therefore this translation cannot be admitted.

But it is requisite first to attend to the different acceptations of the word *שָׁלַךְ* *shalek*, which with the feminine prefix, is rendered, *she cast.* It embraces the following meanings, to cast, forsake, abandon, leave. Ezek. xvi. 5, *But thou wast cast out (left) in the open field.* *וַתִּשְׁלַךְ* *va tushlek*, cannot with any propriety here, be translated by, *cast out*; it is one word, which is properly rendered *left*, or *abandoned*; which with the prefixes, reads as in the new translation. And thus, a word should be chosen agreeably to the idiom of the verb. Now as she could not cast him, it is obvious that she left him, because it is said in the following verse, *let me not see the death of the child.* This branch of the proposition will then read, *and she left the lad.*

The word *וַתֵּלֶךְ* *ha sichim*, is translated *shrubs*; I shall confine myself to the literal meaning of the word, as I find it necessarily translated in other parts of scripture. This sense is only given in two places beside this; in neither of which can it possibly have any such meaning. See Job xxx. 4, 7, *Who cut up mallows by the burlushes,—Among the bushes they brayed.* But we can form no idea of what is meant by, *cutting up mallows by the burlushes, and juniper roots for their meat*, ver. 4;

assistance, about a bow shot; for she said, I will not see the death of the lad: so she waited for assistance; then she raised her voice, and wept.

17 But God heard, the voice of the youth; for the messenger of God, made a proclamation

or braying among the bushes, and being gathered together under the nettles, verse 7.

Now whether we take *וַתֵּלֶךְ* *sichim*, under *וַתֵּלֶךְ* *siyich*, or *וַתֵּלֶךְ* *sichah*; it means, to be depressed, to be sorrowful; and in this state of mind, to be left to religious meditation. See Gen. xxiv. 63, *Isaac went forth to meditate*; Psa. cxix. 148, *that I might meditate*; ver. 78, *I will meditate—to commune*; 2 Kings ix. 11, *his communication*; Job vii. 11, *I will complain*; Psa. lxxvii. 3, *I complained*;—lxxviii. 6, *I commune*;—lv. 2, *in my complaint*;—lxiv. 1, *in my prayer*. Some lexicon writers have given this word the meaning of *swim*; and according to idiom, not improperly. See Psa. vi. 7, *make I my bed to swim*: and though this be not the literal translation, no one can doubt of the sense being conformable, as it stands in the common version, as the psalmist was in great trouble.

Hence it appears, that she in her trouble made an application to God by the priest of the tabernacle; for it is not consistent to suppose that she sat over against the child, that she might not see his death; had she not proceeded to the tabernacle, to procure what was necessary for his support, and for information, affection certainly would have induced a mother to have staid to the last moment of his existence.

With this view of the subject, the words *וַתֵּלֶךְ* *tachath achad*, rendered, *under one*, viz. UNDER ONE OF THE SHRUBS; have a very different application; *וַתֵּלֶךְ* *tachath*, has evidently the same translation as it has in Exod. xxi. 23, 24, 25, viz. *for, or because of*; but the latter, viz. *because of*, is the most proper; eye, BECAUSE OF eye—tooth, BECAUSE OF tooth, &c. Not an eye FOR an eye, but an eye, BECAUSE OF an eye. That is, BECAUSE OF life being taken, the person was to forfeit his life. The same reading of this word is obvious, Isa. lxi. 8; *Beauty, BECAUSE OF ashes; the oil of joy, BECAUSE OF mourning; the garment of praise, BECAUSE OF the spirit of heaviness.* Zeph. ii. 10, *This shall they have BECAUSE OF their pride.* And *וַתֵּלֶךְ* *achad*, the same as in Ezek. xxxiii. 30, *another*. The proposition then truly reads agreeably to the original, and the obvious meaning of the sacred writer, thus; *Then she left the lad, because of another communication.*

16. *And sat her down.* This mode of expression is obsolete; that she should sit her down, is not sense: *וַתֵּשֶׁב* *va teshab lah*, is thus translated. The verb, like all others, has a variety of applications; to sit, remain, inhabit, wait, attend, tarry, stay, according to idiom. And *וַתֵּשֶׁב* *lah*, reads, *even herself*. *וַתֵּשֶׁב* *miniged*, rendered *over against him*, is obviously wrong; it is not a compound, and the word *him*, is supplied. It means, attendance, assistance. Gen. ii. 18, *to assist him*: and which with the *ו* mem, prefixed, viz. *for*; the clause reads, *Then she went, and waited, even herself, for assistance.* As it were a bow shot. Heb. *afar off, the shot of a bow.*

17. *And the angel of God called to Hagar out of heaven.* Thus the sacred writer inculcates the belief in the providence of God; God heard the voice of the youth. According to the authorized version, it seems as though an angel, an immortal being, called to Hagar from the sky, while she was lost in the wilderness: this is the generally received opinion. I shall frequently have occasion to remind the reader, that the word

to Hagar, from heaven; and he said to her, What concerneth thee Hagar? thou shalt not fear; because God hath heard the voice of the lad, before whom he is there.

18 Arise, raise the youth; and support him by thy hand: for I must appoint him for a great nation.

מלאך melake, rendered *angel*, literally means an earthly messenger, sent on a heavenly errand: and that in these places called by the name of wilderness, there were tabernacles erected for the worship of God; in which were the Cherubim, the medium of the divine communication. That the word *מלאך melake*, means an earthly messenger, and is so translated in the authorized version, see Isa. xlii. 19, *as my messenger, I will send*; Ezek. xxi. 40, *unto whom מלאך melake, a messenger was sent*; Hag. i. 13, *Then spake Haggai the מלאך melake, messenger of the Lord*; Zach. xi. 7, *The lips of the priest should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth, for he is the messenger of the Lord*. From which it is obvious, that wherever this word occurs, it always means those who were appointed to receive the communication from God, from above the mercy-seat in the holy place; and that it does not mean a heavenly being, sent from heaven to give information to man. This would have rendered the order which God had himself established to commune from between the Cherubim, altogether unnecessary; as being unforeseen, or defective in some part, and therefore not equal to all the purposes which he had designed at the beginning.

The messenger and the tabernacle seem to have been well known to Hagar: in ch. xvi. 7, when she fled from the face of her mistress, it is said in the common version, *And the angel of the Lord found her by a fountain of water in the wilderness*. Also in the 13th verse of the same chapter we read, *and she called the name of Jehovah who spake to her, Thou God seest me: for she said, Truly thus also here, I have looked after him that seeth me*, viz. by thus, in this place, inquiring of God in the appointed way of that dispensation, to know his will concerning her future conduct. It was above fourteen years since she was commanded to return to her mistress: she obeyed; but now the time had come when, according to the law of the land, both she and Ishmael were to be removed from the house of Abraham; therefore the necessity of further information. Now as God did not commune with man in any other way than by that which he had ordained, from between the Cherubim, we have no authority, except the improper translation of this and similar passages, to conclude, that any such casual communications were ever given. The order which God had established, and which he had commanded to be strictly observed, was abundantly sufficient for all the purposes for which he had given it.

The word *וַיִּקְרָא wayikra*, rendered in the common version, *and he called*, is the same word, with the same construction, as in Exod. xxxii. 5, is translated, *and made proclamation*. And with *וַיִּשְׁמַע יְיָ min ha shaamayim*, it reads, as in the new translation.

Thus we find who this messenger was that called to Hagar out of heaven: when Hagar wept before God, ver. 16, it is said, *God heard the voice of the youth*; the sacred writer continues: *for the messenger of God made a proclamation to Hagar, וַיִּשְׁמַע יְיָ min ha shaamayim, FROM HEAVEN*. That is, he communicated by a proclamation in the tabernacle, the informa-

19 Then God opened her eyes; and she saw a well of water: so she went and filled the bottle with water; and gave it to the youth to drink.

20 Now God was with the youth, moreover he increased: and he remained in the wilderness; and became mighty by the bow.

21 When he dwelt in the wilderness of Paran,

tion he had received from God. Consequently the person who was the officiating priest in the tabernacle where Hagar applied for information, when she left Ishmael, was the messenger of the Lord, who communicated the information in the following verses.

Where he is. This is improper: there are two words in the original, which are not noticed in the common version: viz. the *2 beth*, prefixed to *וְעִשָּׂר esher*, which should be rendered by the word *before*, and which with *וְעִשָּׂר esher*, i. e. *whom*, reads, *before whom*, and *וְעִשָּׂר esher*, *there*. The clause then reads, *before whom he is there*.

18. *For I will make him a great nation*. This passage, like the one noticed, ch. xvi. 10, makes the messenger declare himself thus, in the common version; on which account, commentators have concluded, that he must have been one of the persons of the Trinity, as no finite being could possibly make such a declaration.

The word *וַיַּעַשׂ wayikra*, is translated, *I will make him*. We have seen that this person, the messenger of God, was the priest at this tabernacle, where Hagar applied for assistance: but no attention has been given here to the impossibility of the performance, by this person, of the thing promised; nor to the various acceptations of this word, according to the meaning of the sacred writer. —It means, *to place, put, lay, appoint*, &c. Exod. ix. 5; 2 Kings xi. 8; Ezek. xxi. 20, *appoint*. Therefore a word should have been chosen under the same root, in conformity with the obvious meaning of the narrative. The words *make* and *appoint*, though of the same radix, are very different in their application: thus the messenger of God was commanded to *appoint him*, but not to *make him, a great nation*. The clause reads, *I must appoint him for a great nation*.

19. *God opened her eyes*. A familiar phrase in Hebrew for acknowledging the providence of God, when it is applied to things visible in this world. This must appear evident, as the eyes of Hagar were already open. Literally her understanding, which is the eye of the mind, was *opened*, or enlightened, and her endeavours were attended with success: not by finding water simply, but she was accommodated with all she wanted agreeably to the phraseological meaning of bread and water, (as above) being directed by the messenger of God at the tabernacle.

And gave the lad drink. The word *וַיִּשְׁכַּח va tishkik*, is translated, *and gave drink*. This word cannot mean both *give* and *drink*; a noun and a verb cannot be expressed in one word. It is the second person singular preter of the verb *שָׁחַח she-chaach*, to run; to move; see Isa. xxxiii. 4, *as the running* —shall he run; Prov. xxviii. 15, *running*.

20. *And he grew*. This is improper, his growth was not to be doubted. The verb *יָגַד yigdaal*, means, to become great, to increase, either as to quantity, numbers, or quality: ch. xxiv. 35, *he is become great, in flocks, and herds, and silver, and gold, and men-servants, and women-servants*. Dan. viii. 4. Thus he increased in power, by property and numbers; for Abraham had established him as a patriarchal prince, in that

then his mother took for him a wife, from the land of Egypt.

22 ¶ Now it was at that time, when Abimelech with Phicol, captain of his host, spake to Abraham, saying: God is with thee in all that thou doest.

23 Therefore now, swear to me before God; Behold, surely thou shalt not lie to me, nor to my son, nor to my grand-son: according to the kindness that I have done to thee, thou shalt do to me; and to the land, wherein thou hast sojourned.

24 Then Abraham said; I will swear.

25 Moreover Abraham reasoned, with Abimelech, concerning a well of flowing water, which the servants of Abimelech had violently taken.

26 And Abimelech said, I knew not who did this thing: and moreover thou didst not declare it to me, for I even have not heard it except this day.

27 Then Abraham took sheep and oxen,

part of the country which was not connected with the hereditary possessions of Isaac. That the increase of his power arose from the ascendancy which his great property and family gave him, will appear from the following clause, when the whole shall be translated: for it should be remembered, that the patriarch Abraham was not a wanderer, as some commentators have supposed. He was acknowledged to be a *mighty prince*, by the great men, or senate of the country; ch. xxiii. 6.

And became an archer. It certainly was not necessary for the sacred writer to inform posterity that Ishmael became an archer: or that he was an accurate marksmen. But it was important for him to shew, that Ishmael became great by arms; and which accords with ch. xvi. 12, *his hand will be against every man, and every man's hand against him, and he shall dwell in the presence of his brethren.* Thus he was to be at the head of a warlike people, who would establish themselves as a nation, though all nations were against them. This has been fulfilled in a most remarkable manner, as observed; for the Arabians, who were the descendants of Ishmael, soon became a great nation: To this day they remain a distinct people, and continue to dwell in the presence of their brethren, the descendants of Isaac. Accordingly the word *רַבָּא* *rabba*, which means *mighty*, should have been translated, but it is omitted in the common version. The clause reads, *and became mighty by the bow.*

20, 21. In the authorized version, we are told twice in these two verses, that Ishmael dwelt in the wilderness of Paran. In the 20th verse the conjunction is properly chosen; but in the 21st verse, no attention has been paid to the various reading of the *vav*, which in this passage requires a conjunction of time, *when*; viz. *when he dwelt in the wilderness of Paran, then his mother took for him a wife from the land of Egypt.* The sacred language is peculiarly accurate; the historian having told us once that he dwelt in the wilderness of Paran, does not record it a second time; but introduces an-

which he gave to Abimelech: and they made a covenant.

28 Now Abraham set up, seven ewe-lambs of the flock, by themselves.

29 Then Abimelech said to Abraham: What mean these seven ewe-lambs, which thou hast set by themselves?

30 And he said, Because the seven ewe-lambs thou shalt take from my hand: for thou shalt be to me for a witness, that I have digged this well.

31 Wherefore he called that place, Beer-sheba; because there they swore, both of them.

32 Thus they made a covenant at Beer-sheba: then Abimelech arose, with Phicol the captain of his host; and they returned to the land of the Philistines.

33 Moreover he planted a grove, at Beer-sheba: for there he preached, in the name of JEHOVAH, the everlasting God.

34 Where Abraham sojourned in the land of the Philistines, many days.

other subject connected with his residence in that place, viz. that during his stay there, he married an Egyptian.

30 to 32. Abimelech seems ignorant concerning the meaning of the sacrifice as offered by the worshippers, and which we may presume gave Abraham an opportunity of instructing him in the true worship of God, ver. 29. For they made a covenant together; joined in the same worship; for this was a sacred rite. At this sacrifice it is said, *they swore both of them, at Beer-sheba, that is, the well of the oath.*

Of my hand. מִיָּדִי *Miyadi*, from my hand.

That they may be a witness unto me. The word *בָּעֵר* *bag-nabur*, which means *passover*, is not noticed in the common version. And *מִיָּדִי* *thiyeh*, which is rendered *that they may be*, is erroneously applied to the lambs, viz. *that they may be a witness.* But it must appear evident that the lambs could not be a witness to Abraham, that the well was passed over to him; nor do we find it so said in the original; for this verb is not the third person plural, as in the common version, but the second person singular future, viz. *thou shalt be*. So that it is applied by Abraham to Abimelech, that he should be a witness at this passing over, that the well belonged to Abraham.

33. *Planted a grove.* It was the custom anciently to plant trees at or near the tabernacle, as it was also to build tabernacles in such places where they could be supplied with water, for the use of the tabernacle, in order to keep the place clean where the animals were killed for the offering. *אֵילִן* *alon*, rendered *oak*, is derived from *אָיִל* *ayil*, which means *strength*, and *durability*; and therefore under oaks they prepared the offering: under the most durable of all trees. Naturalists inform us that an oak is 300 years in its progress to perfection, 300 years in its prime, and 300 years in its decay; and therefore a more proper subject could not have been chosen to represent the eternity of the God they worshipped.

34. *Called on the name.* That is, preached, or proclaimed, for *וַיִּקְרָא* *vayikra*, signifies taught the people: that the God who made the heavens was only to be worshipped.

CHAP. XXII.

NOW it was after these transactions, that God proved Abraham: and he said to him, Abraham; and he answered, Here am I.

2 Thus he said, Take now thy son, thine only

NOTES ON CHAP. XXII.

1. *God did tempt Abraham.* This translation cannot be admitted; for had the translators noticed what the apostle says, they must have given the word *mu'nisach*, which they have rendered *did tempt*; its radical meaning. The apostle says, *Neither tempteth he any man*, Jam. i. 13.

In the first proposition, the verb *mu'nisach*, which is translated *tempt*, means to *prove*, *try*, *experience*, 2 Chron. xxxii. 31; 1 Sam. xvii. 39; Exod. xv. 25; to *adventure*, Deut. xxviii. 56.

2. *And offer him there for a burnt offering.*

This is one of the most unaccountable things in the sacred history, as it stands in the vulgar versions. Ancient and modern objectors have said, "Is it possible to suppose that the Supreme Being, who knows what is in man, would require him to give a proof of his faith and obedience, by murdering his only son, and this in direct opposition to his commands under that dispensation?" It is not possible to suppose any thing of the kind, if we recollect that God is perfection itself, and that he does not act in opposition to his own commands; for he who had prohibited the shedding of human blood on pain of death, would not command such sacrifices to be made.

In order therefore to obtain the true meaning of the sacred writer in this important passage, we must abide by the literal sense of the original Hebrew, by which we shall be enabled to form a right conclusion concerning it, which will be in conformity with the justice of God, and the moral precepts in every other part of scripture.

But the intelligent reader will naturally ask this question: If the translation be wrong, why has this error been retained for so many ages? The reason is obvious; the first Christian translation (as observed in the Introduction) was made in Greek by Symmachus, and two hundred years afterwards Jerome, who could not read Hebrew without the assistance of a Jew, with whose assistance he compared his translation with the original, was the first who attempted to give a translation from Hebrew into Latin; or rather, who revised the old Vulgate then in use, which was a version from the Greek, the present Vulgate being only a mixture, ex Hieronymi, veteris Vulgate, et Theodotionis editionibus. To this the council of Trent have affixed their seal of infallibility. And though it has so many marks of human infirmity, and scarce a page that does not betray the ignorance of the compiler, yet is it with them sacred and canonical, the authentic scripture. See the learned Bates's Integ. Heb. Text.

From this translation all the European translations have been made: and thus all the errors we find in every page of the authorized version, have had their origin from this contaminated fountain, the Latin Vulgate; and which the council of Trent, in order to cover their ignorance of the Hebrew, have declared to be infallible. This is the reason why these errors have found their way into the modern versions: there they must necessarily remain, till, by a literal translation from the Hebrew, it be shewn, that not any such errors are there to be met with. Having thus given the reason why this error concerning the offering up of Isaac is still retained in the present version, I shall proceed to lay the literal translation of the Hebrew before the reader.

Isaac was about thirty years of age, at which time those who

one whom thou lovest, even Isaac, and depart; go to the land of Moriah: and cause him to ascend there concerning the offering, upon one of the mountains, which I will mention to thee.

were intended for the ministry were ordained agreeably to the custom under that dispensation; consequently Abraham must have then been a hundred and thirty years old. The reason for their being sent to the mountain Moriah appears obvious. In other places, I have shewn that it was the custom anciently to build tabernacles on mountains; and we find that when Abraham was called from Chaldaea, he visited these places of worship, built altars, and preached in the name of a living God. Now as the mountain Moriah was at Jerusalem, or which was a tabernacle where Melchizedek was the high-priest of the Most high God; where the temple was afterward built, and where the Messiah was to make his appearance; and Isaac being the representative of him who was to abolish all sacrifice; for these reasons they were sent to the place which God had chosen to put his name there. And as Abraham was now far advanced in life, it was necessary for Isaac to be fully instructed concerning the coming of the Messiah, and there acknowledged before the great congregation at Salem; not alone on the top of a mountain, where he only could be the witness to this transaction. There can be no doubt but this visitation was at one of those periods when afterwards the whole of the males assembled at Jerusalem. For it cannot be supposed that the priesthood, which had been established from the time of Noah, and at the head of which in the time of Abraham Melchizedek presided, could be different in its order from the priesthood in the time of Moses, except with respect to the first-born; otherwise, the sacred writer would have informed us. Every first-born son in the land was eligible to be appointed to the priesthood: the great congregation were by the inauguration of Isaac informed, that he was the accepted representative head of the church; the representative of the Messiah, by whom all nations were to be blessed, and who was to make his appearance in the line of Isaac.

Our first inquiry will necessarily be concerning the true translation and application of *ni'ym ve hagnalehu*, which in the common version is rendered, *and offer him up*. This verb is in the Hiphil conjugation, and is used in the following sense, viz. to *cause another to ascend*, Exod. viii. 5; *ni'ym ve hagnal, and cause to come up, or ascend*, which is the proper word: Numb. xx. 5, *have ye made us to ascend*; xxi. 6, *have ye brought us up*; Ezek. xxiv. 8, *that it might cause to ascend*; Amos iv. 10, *and I have made to ascend*; Ezek. xvi. 3; — xxxix. 4.

See where the same radical word, without the masculine singular, is translated *brought up*, 1 Sam. xii. 6; 2 Kings xvii. 36; 2 Chron. i. 4; — viii. 11; Jer. xvi. 14; — xxxiii. 7, 8. Again, 2 Kings xvii. 4; Hos. xii. 13, *brought*. Also Gen. i. 24, *and bring*; Exod. xxxii. 1, *brought us up*; Josh. ii. 6, *brought them up*; 1 Sam. xix. 15, *bring him up*. This is the true meaning of this word, and with the masculine pronoun singular *him*, it literally reads, *And bring him*.

ni'ym Gnalah, is rendered properly by *burnt-offering*. But the *lamed* prefixed, requires the same rendering as in Gen. iii. 21, *to*. This word will truly read as in other parts of scripture, thus, *to a burnt-offering*. The whole clause will then literally read agreeably to the original, and in perfect conformity with the divine denunciations concerning human sacrifice, thus, *And bring him to a burnt-offering*.

3 So Abraham rose early in the morning, and girded his ass, then he took two of his youths with him; also with Isaac his son: now he had divided the wood of the offering, then they arose and went to the place, of which God spake to him.

4 And on the third day, Abraham raised his eyes, and he saw the place, afar off.

5 Also Abraham said to his youths, Abide you here; with the ass, and I with the youth will go yonder: for we will worship, then we will return to you.

6 Now Abraham took the wood of the offering, which he laid upon Isaac his son; also he took in his hand, the fire, and the knife: then they went both of them together.

7 Moreover Isaac spake to Abraham his father, and he said, My father; and he said, Here am I my son: then he said, Behold the

Abraham had been in the ministry about a hundred years; the true worship of God by his preaching had now become very general in the land of Canaan; therefore he who had been teaching the people for so long a period, must have been well acquainted with every particular in the worship under that dispensation. He knew it was consistent with the positive command of God to offer sacrifice; and he also knew that it was in direct opposition to the express command of God, to do after the abomination of the people of the land, by offering human sacrifice. This appears from the question of Isaac, ver. 7, *Where is the lamb for an offering?* The reply of Abraham deserves more attention than has been given to it: *My son, God will provide himself a lamb, for a burnt-offering.* By which he referred Isaac to the custom at the morning and evening sacrifice, when the ram was provided in the sacrificial grove before the tabernacle. But it must be remembered, that though Abraham preached against the abomination of offering human sacrifice, yet he believed in the ancient promise, that the Messiah was to be offered in sacrifice by offering himself; and he shall find he believed that Isaac was to be the Messiah.

6. *The grove of the offering; the fire.* The consecrated things of his tabernacle.

8. *God will provide himself a lamb.* The lamb was already provided agreeably to the order of that dispensation: it was in the enclosure or grove, viz. the grove where all the sacrifices were prepared before they were brought to the altar. Therefore the word *is* too, rendered for himself, reads, before him.

9. *Build an altar.* If the reader attends to this passage, he will find that the vulgar version cannot be correct. Abraham had left the young men, but for a short time, only, while he went to the tabernacle to worship; he had not time to build an altar. The verb *בנין* *banin*, is translated as the common preter, viz. *he built*; but it is the *pluperfect*, and should be translated, *For he had built.* That is, in the early part of his life, when he travelled over the land of Canaan to promulgate the worship of God, he had, at this tabernacle on Mount Moriah, built, or dedicated an altar there.

11. *The angel of the Lord called to him out of heaven.* It

fire, and the wood; but where is the lamb, for a burnt offering?

8 And Abraham replied; God will provide before him the lamb, for a burnt offering my son: thus they went both of them together.

9 When they came to the place which God had mentioned to him, for Abraham had built there an altar; then he laid the wood in order: and he bound Isaac his son, and laid him upon the altar on the wood:

10 Now Abraham put forth his hand, and took the knife to slay his son.

11 But the messenger of JEHOVAH, made a proclamation concerning him, from heaven; and he said, Abraham, Abraham: and he answered, Here am I.

12 Then he said, Thou shalt not put forth thy hand, against the youth; for thou shalt not do any harm to him: because now I know, that

has been understood that when Abraham was about to offer Isaac, that an angel appeared in the clouds, and called to him. I need not here enlarge on the word *angel*; on the absurdity of invisible immaterial beings taking upon themselves materiality to render themselves visible to mortals, or that the order which God had established at the beginning to communicate with man from above the Cherubim, was not equal to answer all the necessities which might require divine aid, until the appearance of him who was to put away all symbols and mediums of communication. It is sufficiently evident that the divine ordination in all the churches before the Christian church, has not been attended to by translators and commentators.

It will be remembered, that Abraham was commanded by a communication in his own tabernacle to go to the land of Moriah, where he had now arrived at the tabernacle on this mount; that here he prepared to offer his son Isaac, who, as all the nations of the earth were to be blessed in him, he had concluded was to be the Messiah; believing God would raise him from the dead, according to the apostle, Heb. xi. 19. And therefore it was at this crisis that the officiating priest of this tabernacle, who is called the *malake, angel*, or properly the messenger of Jehovah, received a communication from above the Cherubim in the Holy of Holies, respecting Isaac, properly said from heaven. This was, as before observed, perfectly consistent with the divine institution when God ordained this medium of communication from the fall; consequently there was nothing more extraordinary in this than what was customary to the time when the divine theocracy was continued at the establishment of the levitical priesthood; when the Shechinah, the symbols, the mediums by which God communed with man, were the same.

The words *וַיִּקְרָא* *va yikra*, and he proclaimed, and the words *מִן הַשָּׁמַיִם* *min ha shamayim*, from the heaven, have the same rendering as in the preceding chapter concerning Hagar; embrace the same views, and have the same rational reading in other parts of scripture.

12. *For now I know that thou fearest God.* The translators have rendered the word *יָרֵא* *yera*, thou fearest, which is wrong. It is the third person singular preter in Kal, literally, he feareth,

he feareth God, moreover neither hast thou withheld thy son, thine only one, from me.

13 Then Abraham raised his eyes and he looked, and behold a ram behind, was fastened in the enclosure, by his horns: so Abraham went and took the ram, and offered him for a burnt-offering, instead of his son.

14 Moreover Abraham called the name of that place, JEHOVAH WILL PROVIDE: for he will

or *reverenceth*, viz. that Isaac feared God. And as this was the divine communication to Abraham, this fear, this very extraordinary degree of reverential awe which he had in the presence of God, is called the *fear of Isaac*, and which induced him to be bound on the altar. So that the translators have erred in the person and tense of the verb.

13. *Caught in a thicket.* *וַיִּקַּח* *nechax*, rendered *caught*, is in the Niphal conjugation, literally, *was fastened*; not that the ram was there taken in a thicket by accident; but this being a tabernacle where the offerings were prepared to be offered, the ram was brought there, as was the custom both morning and evening; so that when the messenger of God, viz. the officiating priest of that tabernacle, informed Abraham that he was not to offer his son, Abraham obeyed, and the ram *was taken* by Abraham instead of his son. So that there is nothing extraordinary in all this; it was according to the divine institution; the officiating priest of the tabernacle declared, that he was not to transgress the divine command, by stretching forth his hand against his son. Therefore the customary sacrifice was provided, which was offered every day under that dispensation.

The word *וַיִּקַּח* *achar*, is in the common version rendered, *behind*; by which it is supposed that Abraham was in the open air on the top of a rugged mountain, and that the ram was caught by accident in a thicket. But the reader will recollect, that at this period, the worship of the true God was publicly taught throughout the whole land, where tabernacles had been built by those who were called *priests of the most high God*, in contradistinction to the idolatrous priests; by Melchizedek and others from the time of Noah; and that Abraham had now been a great many years in Canaan, and had during this long period been preaching in the name of the Lord. Therefore we cannot suppose that this transaction was such as is represented in the common versions.

It will also be recollected, that at these places there were *groves, thickets, or enclosures of trees*, where the offerings were prepared before they were offered on the altar; as in after-time, when the sacrifice was prepared in the court, or outer place of the tabernacle, before it was brought to the altar. And thus the ram was *taken in*, or brought to the *בִּטְחָה* *bastake*, i.e. a *copse, coppice, thicket, or grove*. This word means to *entwine*; to *enweave* the branches of trees which are so closely arranged, that they cross, or entwine with each other: Jer. iv. 7; Psa. lxxiv. 5, *thick trees*. It properly means here the *enclosure, or grove*, to which the ram was taken for sacrifice.

By his horns. The customary way of bringing the animal to be sacrificed.

14. *As it is said to this day.* This is one of the passages where we are told by most writers, that the verb in the future form must be translated in the preter tense. This however cannot be allowed in any part of scripture.

The words in the common version, *as it is said to this day*,

certify this day; In the mount JEHOVAH will provide.

15 Then the messenger of JEHOVAH, made a proclamation concerning Abraham, again from heaven;

16 Thus he said before me; I have sworn saith JEHOVAH: truly forasmuch as thou hast done this thing; and thou hast not withheld thy son, even thine only one:

do not refer to any determinate time; they may be supposed to refer to the time of the writer; but we are not told by this translation, whether they were written by Moses or Abraham. The true translation however will help us.

The word *וַיִּקַּח* *yaameer*, is rendered *it is said*; but as the verb is the third person singular future, it should be translated, *he will certify, or declare*. It is the speech of Abraham, who says, *he (God) will certify this day, in the mount; Jehovah will provide*. The intelligent reader will see, that as the sacrifice now offered, was representative of the Messiah the Redeemer; that this is a declaration concerning him, that God would in the appointed time fulfil his ancient promise for the redemption of man.

Jehovah-Jireh, in the mount of the Lord it shall be seen. The question is, *What shall be seen?* for we are not told in the translation. This is perhaps one of the most difficult passages in the original, to understand in any other language. The word JEHOVAH, comprehends the *past, the present, and the future*, (as above). It means JEHOVAH HATH SEEN, JEHOVAH SEETH, JEHOVAH WILL SEE. But in every other language the tenses are expressed by different forms of the verb when joined with the divine name: no other language has the power like the Hebrew, of comprehending in one word, the *past, present, and future*. The Septuagint render the words *וַיִּקַּח* *Jehovah Jireh, the Lord will see*; by *Κύριος εὐρεῖ*, *the Lord hath seen*: and the English translators, *in the mount of the Lord it shall be seen*; one rendering it in the preter, the other in the future time; but they are both consistent with the original and with truth; for as above, it is not in the power of any language, except the Hebrew, to express the essential name of God in the *past, present, and future*. The history resolves the question respecting what had been, and what should be seen; God had seen the idolatry of the Chaldean empire, and called Abraham from among them, that he might promulgate those precepts of morality and true religion which had been given to Noah. He saw then the idolatry of the nations of Canaan, when he called Abraham: and in this mount of the Lord he manifested his displeasure whenever they departed from the true worship to that of idols. In agreement with these words, we find that in the seventh generation after Abraham, the true worship of God was seen to be established by the Israelites in *this mountain Moriah*; and in *this mountain* five hundred years after Moses, the Lord saw it was necessary, in order to impress their minds with a due reverence for the object of their worship, to cause the temple to be built, and the Shechinah, or divine dwelling, to be fixed there; and in *this mountain* near one thousand years after Solomon, did the true Messiah make his appearance, agreeably to what had been foretold by the prophets; who saw the corruption of the true worship which before had been given to Abraham, and taught once more in *this mountain*, in the temple, the true worship of God.

16. *By myself have I sworn, saith the Lord.* By this reading

17 Surely blessing I will bless thee, also multiplying I will multiply thy posterity, like the stars of the heaven; yea as the sand which is

upon the shore of the sea: and thy posterity shall possess, the gate of his enemies.

18 And all the nations of the earth, shall

in the common version there is no distinction made between the messenger of Jehovah, and Jehovah himself. For this communication is given to Abraham by the messenger, and yet the messenger is made to be Jehovah. These errors arise from not considering how God communicated with man; for he always made known his will in the way which he had ordained, from above the Cherubim.

We have seen that the messenger was the officiating minister at the tabernacle, which was erected on the mount Moriah, who received the communication respecting Abraham at the inauguration of Isaac, who was now to succeed as the supreme representative head of the church. Now after Abraham had offered the sacrifice, he received another communication while officiating in the holy-place, ver. 18. And in this verse, it is said, referring to God, THUS HE SAID, בִּי בִּי, BEFORE ME, (the messenger) I HAVE SWORN, SAITH JEHOVAH. That is, in this second communication, the messenger declared, that these were the express words of God, which were given before him, viz. I have sworn, saith Jehovah. Not that the messenger of Jehovah was Jehovah himself, as he is said to be in the common version.

The words בִּי נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי בִּי *bi nishbangti*, are here rendered, in the common version, by myself I have sworn; a mode of expression which is very improper. Surely it was not necessary for him, whose word is truth itself, to swear by himself! He wills his eternal purposes, and they are accomplished. Consequently it cannot be the case when God is the speaker; therefore it will appear that this word must have a different mode of expression when applied to God. I have rendered it by the word *declared*, which is fully comprehended in the root; indeed it is its primary meaning.

18. And in thy seed, &c. Here we read that all the nations of the earth were to be blessed in the posterity of Isaac; and in the 21st verse of the 17th chapter, it is said, *But my covenant will I establish with Isaac.* Therefore it is necessary to inquire into the nature of this covenant, which was to be established with Isaac; how this appears to have been understood by Abraham; how Isaac was instructed by Abraham in the order of the divine providence concerning the Redeemer; and how all the nations of the earth were to be blessed in his posterity: which inquiry will end with the 18th verse.

The word בְּרִית *berithi*, in ch. xvii. 21, is rendered *my covenant*, by which, in the 18th verse, all the nations of the earth were to be blessed. But this word cannot with strict propriety be rendered by *covenant*, as applied between God and man, because a covenant presupposes an equal power to exist between the two contracting parties, to make such a covenant (as was observed). There is no moral fitness on the part of man, who is all imperfect, to enter into a covenant with God, who is all perfection. The בְּרִית *berithi*, is the gift of God, by the true Messiah, for the redemption of man, as the very root of the word signifies. It literally means, to purify, to cleanse, to separate; a purifying sacrifice. See Ps. xviii. 20, כִּבְרִית *kebot yaada*, ACCORDING TO THE CLEANNESS of my hands; — xxiv. 4, לִבְרִית *libar-Isaiah*, AND A CLEAN heart; Ezek. xi. 8, וְכִבְרִית *wakrothi*, AND I WILL PURGE them out from among you; Jer. xi. 22; Mal. iii. 2, וְכִבְרִית *ukborith mikabsim*, and like fuller's soap; but which should be rendered, and like the cleanser of the fuller. The nature of the בְּרִית *berithi*, is

fully explained in the following verse, *And he shall purify the sons of Levi.* See also Jud. viii. 3; — ix. 4. But there was no power in man to cleanse, purify, or separate himself from evil, independent of faith in, and obedience to this *berith*: this covenant between God and man.

But the great question is, How came the offering up of Isaac to have been so understood by Abraham, a thing so contrary to the express command of God; when, for the abolition of such victims, he was called from among the Chaldeans? If the reader attends to the history, he will find, it was the constant and universal belief of the church, to the time of Abraham, that agreeably to the ancient promise, a person was to appear, who was to restore man to the state of happiness and peace, which was enjoyed in the paradisaical state; that is, a state in which sacrifices were to be unnecessary; who was to shew man a new and living way; without dead sacrifices; an inward sacrifice by the silence of all flesh, Zech. ii. 13, which in a state of nature opposeth the divine commands. And concerning the coming of this person, Abraham had been preaching for above half a century. He believed that this person was to be offered up as a sacrifice; and when he was told, that Isaac was the person in whom his posterity was to be blessed; that the covenant was to be established in Isaac, in whom all the nations of the earth were to be blessed; the delivery from sacrifices, rites, ceremonies, oblations, &c. by one sacrifice; at the same time believing that God would raise him from the dead; he concluded that he was to be the sacrifice; and yet that he should not lose him, but that God would exert his power in his immediate resurrection.

Therefore it appears that the patriarch Abraham believed, by Isaac as high-priest, at the renewal of the dispensation given to him, that the ancient promise was to be accomplished in his person; that he was to be the Messiah, the divine person when sacrificed and raised again, in whom the posterity of Abraham, and all nations, were to be blessed. His conception was a miracle; he knew by the ancient promise, that the seed of the woman was to bruise the head of the serpent. God had also informed him from the Cherubim, that he would establish his covenant, his purifier, from, with, in, or by Isaac. Now as Abraham knew that there was no purification, no effectual atonement to be made but by the Messiah; he therefore concluded, that Isaac, as high-priest, was to be the בְּרִית *berithi*, the purifying sacrifice; for, as observed, so says the Apostle, Heb. xi. 19, *Accounting that God was able to raise him up, even from the dead: from whence also he received him in a figure.* Thus, according to the apostle, Abraham believed that after he had offered Isaac, God was able to raise him up. That is, in this world, otherwise all the nations of the earth could not have been blessed in the posterity of Isaac.

It is said, in Isaac shall thy seed be blessed. But the posterity of Abraham was not blessed, or called in Isaac, any more than they were in Jacob or Moses. Therefore this evidently refers, as was said, to a person by whom and in whom the posterity of Abraham, or the faithful ones, in all nations, were to be blessed, or called; even the Messiah, concerning whom Abraham believed Isaac was to be the real sacrifice prefigured by the types, and that God was able to raise him from the dead; from whence also he received him in and by the sacrificial figures. This makes plain the communication to Abraham as above, where we have found that instead of the second person singular

bless themselves in thy posterity: a reward, for thou hast hearkened, to my voice.

19 Then Abraham returned to his youths; who rose, and went together, to Beer-sheba: for Abraham dwelt at Beer-sheba.

20 ¶ Now it was after these transactions, that Abraham was informed, saying: Behold, Milcah hath born also children to Nahor thy brother.

21 Hur his first-born, and Buz his brother: also Kamul, the father of Aram.

22 And Chesed and Hazo, and Pildash, and Jidlaph: also Bethuel.

23 Now Bethuel begat Rebekah: these eight Milcah bare to Nahor, brother of Abraham.

24 Moreover his concubine, whose name was Reumah: also she bare Tebah, and Gaham, and Thahash and Maachah.

applied to Abraham, viz. *For now I know that thou fearest God*, the verb is the *third* person singular applied to Isaac, viz. *for now I know that he feared God*. That is, the messenger, or officiating priest, of that tabernacle *now knew*; for such an expression cannot be applied to an angel of heaven, as not knowing the business he was sent about. This shews that God was satisfied with the obedience, *the fear of Isaac*; and that Abraham had been mistaken in supposing that he was to be the Messiah, in whom all the nations of the earth were to be blessed. Thus it appears that God did not give a command to offer up Isaac for a burnt offering, which (as observed) would have been in direct opposition to his command; and instead of abolishing human sacrifices, against which (as observed) Abraham had been preaching all his life, it would the more firmly have established them; for the entire abolition of which he was called from his native country. He was commanded to *bring him up to the mountain, not to sacrifice him*, but to instruct him in the sacred representative mysteries concerning the coming of Messiah the Redeemer.

It is also necessary further to observe, that this verb *חברו* *hithbaarakou*, is in the common version rendered in the passive conjugation Niphal; but it is in the Hithpaal conjugation, and should be rendered accordingly, *and they shall bless themselves*.

Here ends this most important communication at the consecration of Isaac to the priesthood. He was indeed a striking figure of the Messiah, who was to make his appearance in his line; under whose eternal reign in the latter days, there was to be a general influx of all nations; who, tired of human slaughter, as the prophet was commanded to declare, were to *beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks, and nations were to learn war no more*. Thus it is here said, that under the divine, and most welcome government of Messiah, the nations were to *bless themselves*.

Because that thou hast obeyed my voice. It appears by the common version, that all the nations of the earth were to be blessed because Abraham had hearkened to the voice of God. But as this is contrary both to scripture and reason, it will also appear plain that the translation of this clause is not consistent with the original. We cannot hesitate in concluding, that the happiness or blessing of any nation, or individual, never depended on the obedience of Abraham; viz. *because he had hearkened to the voice of God*.

¶ NOW was the life of Sarah, a hundred and twenty seven years: the years of the life of Sarah,

2 When Sarah died in Kirjath-arba, the same is Hebron, in the land of Canaan: and Abraham came to mourn for Sarah, even to weep for her.

3 Then Abraham rose from before the face of his dead: and he spake to the children of Heth, saying;

4 I am a sojourner, though dwelling with you: grant ye to me a possession, a sepulchre with you; for I must bury my dead, from before my face.

5 Then the children of Heth answered Abraham, saying to him,

6 Hear us. My lord, a prince of God art

Accordingly the word *app gneeckeb*, which is rendered *because*, literally means, *a reward*. See where the same word, both consonants and vowels, is necessarily so translated, Psa. xix. 11, *In keeping of them there is great reward*; — xl. 15, *Let them be desolate for a reward*. The word *תן עשר*, which follows, and is rendered by *that*, viz. *because that*, is then, agreeably to rule, to be translated as, with the same construction, it is in other parts of scripture, by *for*. The word *תן עשר* *shamagna*, rendered by *obeyed*, plainly means *hearkened*; Gen. iii. 17, *thou hast hearkened*. See also the same word 2 Chron. xxv. 16. And the *2 beth*, prefixed to *לפי קולי*, *my voice*, omitted in the common version, supplies the dative case. So that the nations of the earth were not to be blessed, *because Abraham obeyed the voice of God*; but that his posterity was to have the priesthood, by which was meant the power of blessing, or publishing the favours of God. The clause reads, *a reward, for thou hast hearkened to my voice*.

NOTES ON CHAP. XXIII.

2. *Sarah died in Kirjath-arba*, or, *the city of Arba*. Many have been the conjectures concerning the origin of this name. Some have concluded, as it literally means *the city of four*, that it was so called because Adam, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, were buried there; and others because it was the burial place of Eve, Sarah, Rebekah, and Leah: agreeably to the Rabbies. But the most scriptural conclusion is, that it was called after the chief of the four brothers, because it was the property of the four brothers, the Anakims; Josh. xiv. 15, *Arba a great man*; and Jud. i. 10.

6. *A mighty prince*. The word *עליון* *Elohyim*, is in the common version rendered *mighty*; but this is evidently an error, there is not another place in the Bible, I believe, where this word has been so erroneously rendered. In every other place, amounting to many hundreds, it is properly translated *God*. The translation, *a mighty prince*, cannot be applied to Abraham at this period, as he was not a temporal prince, he had not even a place to bury his dead. He is called *a 'prince of God* in the original, not a temporal prince. This shews that he had succeeded in establishing the worship of God among the descendants of Heth, who then governed the land; he had convinced them of the wickedness of idol worship, however plausible, and on that account they had the highest veneration

thou in the midst of us; among the best of our sepulchres, bury thou thy dead: not a man concerning the same, will withhold from thee his sepulchre, bury thy dead.

7 Then Abraham rose, and bowed himself before the people of the land, even the sons of Heth.

8 And he spake to them, saying: If it be your mind, to bury my dead, from before my face; hear ye me, and intercede for me with Ephron, the son of Zoar;

9 Then he will assign to me, the cave of Machphelah which belongs to him, at the end of his land: for the full value he shall give it to me, in the midst of you, for a sepulchral possession.

10 Now Ephron dwelt, in the midst of the sons of Heth; and Ephron the Hittite answered Abraham, in the audience of the sons of Heth, before all that came to the gate of the city, saying;

11 Now my lord hear me; The field I have given to thee, also the cave which is therein, to thee I have given it: in the presence of the children of my people, I have given it to thee, bury thy dead.

12 Again, Abraham bowed himself, in the presence of the people of the land;

13 And he spake to Ephron in the audience of the people of the land, saying; But if thou wilt hear me: I have deposited money for the field, take it from me, and I will bury my dead there.

14 Then Ephron answered Abraham, saying to him,

15 My lord hear me; The land is worth four hundred shekels of silver, what is that between me and thee? therefore bury thy dead.

16 Thus Abraham hearkened, to Ephron;

for him. They called him a *prince of God*, one who stood high in the divine favour. A similar title was given to Jacob, who was called *Israel*, which means literally, a *prince of God*.

7. And Abraham stood up. Hebrew, as in the new translation.

9. That he may give. Hebrew, as in the new translation.

10. The gate of the city. The assembly of the elders, who sat in the judgment-hall, which in the east, was always built at the gate of the city.

20. For a possession of a burying place. There is no word for *place*, and the word of repeated, with the article *a*, is redundant; this expression is obsolete, as well as inelegant, if not improper. Hebrew, as in the new translation.

then Abraham weighed to Ephron, the silver which he mentioned in the audience of the sons of Heth: four hundred shekels of silver, passing with the merchant.

17 So Ephron confirmed the field which was in Machphelah, which is before the front of Mamre, the field, also the cave which was therein; even every tree which was on the field, and on all the borders around,

18 To Abraham for a possession, in the sight of the sons of Heth: before all that came to the gate of his city.

19 Then afterwards straightway, Abraham buried Sarah his wife, in the cave of the field of Machphelah, before the front of Mamre; the same is Hebron, in the land of Canaan.

20 Thus he confirmed the field, and the cave which was therein, to Abraham, for a sepulchral possession, among the sons of Heth.

CHAP. XXIV.

¶ NOW Abraham was old; the days had come: when JEHOVAH had blessed Abraham, in all things.

2 So Abraham said to his servant, the elder of his house; who ruled over all that belonged to him: Put now thy hand under my thigh;

3 For I will swear thee, before JEHOVAH God of the heaven; and God of the earth: that thou shalt not take a woman, for my son, from the daughters of the Canaanites; in the midst of whom I dwell.

4 But to my country, and to my kindred, thou shalt go: there thou shalt take a woman for my son, even Isaac.

5 Then the servant said to him; Perhaps the woman will not be willing to follow me, to this land: on returning, shall I return with thy son, to the land from whence thou camest?

NOTES ON CHAP. XXIV.

1. And Abraham was old and well stricken in age. Wherever these words *בָּיָמָיו* *ba bayamim*, occur, the translators have fallen into the error of rendering them, *well stricken in age*. There is not any authority in the original for saying a second time in the same verse, that he was an old man. *בָּיָמָיו* *ba*, means *to come, to arrive*, and *בָּיָמָיו* *bayamim*, *time, days, season*; that is, *the days came, when Jehovah blessed Abraham in all things*.

2. The customary way of taking an oath for the due performance of an agreement. See chap. xxiii.

5. Must I needs bring thy son again. In the vulgar version, it appears here that Isaac went with the servant, as it is said, *must I needs bring thy son again*. But as this is contradicted

6 And Abraham said to him: Thus conduct thyself; thou shalt not return with my son, thither.

7 JEHOVAH God of the heaven, who took me from the house of my father, and from the land of my nativity; yea who spake to me, and who swore before me, saying; To thy posterity I will give this land: he will send his messenger before thy face, and thou shalt take a woman for my son, from thence.

8 But if the woman will not be willing to follow after thee; then thou shalt be clear from this my oath: only with my son, thou shalt not return thither.

9 So the servant put his hand under the thigh of Abraham his lord; and he swore to him, concerning this matter.

10 Then the servant took ten camels, camels of his lord, and he departed, with sufficient wealth of his lord, in his hand: thus he arose and went to Aram of the rivers, to the city of Nahor.

11 Now he made the camels kneel without the city, by a well of water; at the time of evening; about the time of going forth to draw.

12 And he said, JEHOVAH, God of my lord Abraham, prepare I pray thee before my face, this day; and shew kindness to my lord Abraham.

13 Behold I stand, by the fountain of water, when the daughters of the men of the city, go forth to draw water;

14 Then it shall be, that the damsel, when I shall say to her, Lower, I pray thee, thy vessel, and I will drink; and she shall say, Drink, and I will also water thy camels: thou hast appointed her to thy servant, for Isaac; and thereby shall I know, that thou hast shewed kindness to my lord.

15 So it was, before he had done speaking,

that behold, Rebekah came forth, who was born to Bethuel son of Milcah, wife of Nahor, brother of Abraham; with her vessel upon her shoulder.

16 Now the damsel had a very beautiful countenance, a virgin, for no man acknowledged her: and she descended to the fountain, to fill her vessel, and she ascended.

17 Then the servant ran to meet her, and he said, Afford me I pray thee a little water, from thy vessel.

18 And she said, Drink my lord: then she hastened and lowered her vessel upon her hand, and she supplied him.

19 When she had done giving him drink, then she said, I will draw for thy camels also, till they have done drinking.

20 Then she hastened, and emptied her vessel into the trough; and she ran again, to the well, to draw: so she drew for all the camels.

21 And the man wondering before her; waited to perceive, whether JEHOVAH had made his journey prosperous, or not.

22 Now it was, as the camels had done drinking, that the man took a jewel of gold, of half a shekel: also two bracelets for her hands, of ten shekels of gold.

23 And he said, Whose daughter art thou? tell me I pray thee: is there in the house of thy father, a place for us, to lodge?

24 Then she said to him; I am the daughter of Bethuel: the son of Milcah, whom she bare to Nahor.

25 Moreover she said to him; Yea we have straw, also abundance of provender, with us, and a place to lodge.

26 Then the man bowed; and worshipped, before JEHOVAH.

27 And he said, Blessed of JEHOVAH, God of my lord Abraham; who refuseth not his mercy, and his truth, to my lord: I am in the way,

in the 64th verse, the error must be in the translation. The words, *must needs, and again*, are not sanctioned by the original. *חָשַׁבְתִּי* *hasheeb*, is to be translated as it is in Jer. vi. 9, *turn back, return*; *אָשִׁיב* *ashib*, is the first person singular future of the verb, and is to be rendered as in 2 Sam. xxiv. 13, *shall I return*, which in connexion with *עִתָּהּ* *etk tinka*, *with thy son*, the verse reads literally as in the new translation.

6. The reader must recollect that the speaker, in the last verse, supposes himself at Aram, and that the damsel refuses to follow him to the land of Canaan; that in case of such refusal, he asks if the nature of his oath obliges him to return again, and then to take Isaac to Aram, viz. to the place from whence thou

camest. He then says, *thou shalt not return with my son thither again*.

10. This shews that Abraham inculcated the belief in the divine providence, even in the most minute concerns of life.

13. *Behold I stand*. It must appear that the *וָאָנֹכִי* *va anochi* should be rendered by *when*, viz. *when the daughters of the men of the city come out, to draw water*.

14. In this verse there are six words in the authorized translation, for which there is not any authority in the Hebrew, viz. *let the same be she that*; it reads far better without them.

21. *Held his peace*. This mode of expression may be understood because it is commonly used. It is however obsolete,

JEHOVAH hath led me, to the house, of the brother of my lord.

28 Then the damsel ran, and she informed the household of her mother, concerning these things.

29 Now Rebekah had a brother, and his name was Laban: then Laban ran to the man, going forth to the fountain.

30 For it was, when seeing the jewel and the bracelets, upon the hands of his sister, and when he heard the words of Rebekah his sister, saying; Thus spake the man to me: that he came to the man, for behold he stood by the camels, at the fountain.

31 Then he said, Come blessed of JEHOVAH; why standest thou without? for I have prepared the house, and a place for camels.

32 So the man came to the house, and he ungirded the camels; then he gave straw and provender for the camels; also water to bathe his feet, and the feet of the men, who were with him.

33 Moreover he set before him food; but he said, I will not eat till that I have told my business: and he said, Speak.

34 Then he said; I am a servant, of Abraham.

35 Now JEHOVAH hath blessed my lord exceedingly, for he is great: yea, be bath given to him, flock and herd, and silver and gold; and men servants and maidens; also camels and asses.

36 Moreover Sarah the wife of my lord, bare a son to my lord, after she was old; and he hath given to him, even all that belongeth him.

37 Now my lord'sware me, saying: Thou shalt not take a woman for my son, from the daughters of the Canaanites, in whose land I dwell;

38 Surely not; to the house of my father, thou shalt go, even to my kindred: there thou shalt take a woman, for my son.

39 Then I said to my lord: Perhaps the woman will not go after me.

40 Moreover he said to me: JEHOVAH, before whose face I have walked, will send his messenger before thee, and he will cause thy journey

to prosper; there thou shalt take a woman for my son, from my kindred, even from the house of my father;

41 Then thou shalt be free from my oath, wherf thou comest to my kindred: for if they will not give one to thee, then thou shalt be free from my oath.

42 Now I came this day, to the fountain, and said, JEHOVAH, GOD of my lord Abraham; if thou art now prospering my journey, whither I am going concerning her:

43 Behold I stand by the fountain of water: and it shall be when the virgin shall come forth to draw, and I say to her; Afford me I pray thee a little water, out of thy vessel;

44 If she shall say to me, Yea drink thou, also I will draw for thy camels; be this the woman, whom JEHOVAH hath appointed for the son of my lord.

45 Before I had done speaking in my heart, now behold Rebekah came forth, with her vessel upon her shoulder; and she descended to the fountain, and she drew: then I said to her, Supply me I pray thee.

46 So she hastened and lowered her vessel from off her, and she said, Drink, and I will also water thy camels: then I drank, and she watered the camels also.

47 Moreover I asked her, and said, Daughter who art thou? and she said, The daughter of Bethuel son of Nahor, whom Milcah bare to him: so I put the jewel upon her face, also the bracelets upon her hands.

48 Moreover I bowed and I worshipped, before JEHOVAH: yea I blessed JEHOVAH GOD of my lord Abraham; because he had led me in the right way, to take the daughter of the brother of my lord, for his son.

49 Now therefore, if you will do kindly, and truly with my lord, declare ye to me: and if not, tell ye to me; and I will turn to the right, or to the left.

50 Then Laban answered, also Bethuel, and

if not improper. *וַיִּשְׁמַע* *machearish* means to cease, 1 Sam. vii. 8; to be silent, Ps. xxviii. 1;—xxxv. 22;—lxxxiii. 1. Therefore it is not translated agreeably to the original; there is no pronoun accompanying the word, and the prefix *ו* *mem* is not noticed by the translators.

38. *But thou shalt go unto my father's house.* This is not the true translation; the negative *וְלֹא*, is omitted, and *וְעַתָּה* is adverbial, i.e. *surely*; the clause reads with far greater effect according to the syntax of the Hebrew.

40. *I walk.* Heb. *I have walked.*

47. *Whose daughter art thou?* Heb. *Daughter who art thou?*

51. *Thy master's son's wife.* The woman for the son of thy lord.

52. *Abraham's servant.* I have preserved the order of the Hebrew syntax, which reads more elegantly, and we get rid of the abbreviation thus; *the servant of Abraham.* Also in the last clause of the vulgar version, the translators have put in the word *bowing*; there is no authority in the original, so they

they said; This matter proceedeth from JEHOVAH: we cannot speak a word to thee, evil or good.

51 Behold Rebekah before thy face, take her and depart: then she shall be the woman for the son of thy lord; according to the word of JEHOVAH.

52 Then it was when the servant of Abraham, heard their words: that he bowed himself to the earth, before JEHOVAH.

53 Now the servant brought jewels of silver, and jewels of gold, also raiment, which he gave to Rebekah: he also gave presents to her brother, and to her mother.

54 Then they ate and drank, he and the men who were with him, and they lodged; and they rose in the morning, and he said, Send me to my lord.

55 Now her brother, and her mother said; The damsel shall abide with us about ten days; afterward she shall go.

56 But he said to them, Hinder me not, for JEHOVAH hath prospered my journey; send me, for I will go to my lord.

57 Then they said, We will call for the damsel, for we will ask her consent.

58 So they called for Rebekah, and said to her; Wilt thou go with this man? and she said, I will go.

59 Then they sent Rebekah their sister, with her attendants; and the servant of Abraham, also with his men.

60 Moreover they blessed Rebekah, and said to her: Thou our sister, live for multitudes: for thy posterity will possess the gate of his enemies.

61 Then Rebekah rose, with her damsels,

and they rode upon the camels, so they went after the man; thus the servant took Rebekah, and departed.

62 Now Isaac came by the entrance of the well of Lahai-roi; for he dwelt in the land of the south.

63 There Isaac went forth to meditate in the field, at the approach of evening; then he raised his eyes, and looked, and behold the camels were coming.

64 Also Rebekah raised her eyes, and she saw Isaac; then she descended, from off the camel.

65 For she said to the servant, Who is this man that walketh in the field to meet us? and the servant said, He is my lord: then she took a vail, and covered herself.

66 Now the servant declared to Isaac, all the things which he had done.

67 So Isaac brought her, to the tabernacle of Sarah his mother; then he took Rebekah, and she became his wife, for he loved her: thus Isaac was comforted, after his mother died.

CHAP. XXV.

¶ THEN Abraham again took a woman, whose name was Keturah.

2 And she bare to him, Zimran and Jokshan, and Medan and Midian, and Ishbak, and Shuah.

3 And Jokshan begat Sheba, and Dedan; and the sons of Dedan were, Ashurim, and Letushim, and Leummim.

4 And the sons of Midian, Ephath, and Ephher, and Hanock; also Abidah, and Eldaah: all these were children of Keturah.

5 Now Abraham gave, even all that he had, to Isaac,

have signified this by *italics*. But the clause reads better preserving the order of the Hebrew.

53. *Precious things.* Heb. *Presents.* There is no authority for *things*.

55. *A few days, at the least ten.* Many commentators have thought this inexplicable. In the common version five words are put in for which there is no authority in the original, viz. *a few at the least*: Houbigant, whose authority has been much resorted to, says, that unless the passage be read *chodesh yasim*, A MONTH OF DAYS, it cannot be understood. But the reading is plain. *in* *ao*, means a dubious state of mind; if, or, about, and *yasim* *ao* *gnaasor*, will literally read thus, *about ten days*. The LXX read the same.

60. *And let thy seed possess.* There is no authority for the word *let*. Heb. *For thy posterity will possess*. It may be asked how should the family of Laban know this? The answer is plain. They knew by the divine communication to Abraham

that nations of people, and that kings were to descend from him; that the covenant was to be established in his posterity. And now, as Rebekah was to be the wife of Isaac, they could, as true believers, declare, that *thousands of millions* were to descend from her.

61. *Followed the man.* The word *achare*, after, is not noticed in the common version. Heb. *and they went after*. Also *va yeeleke*, is rendered, *and went his way*. It is a most barbarous expression; and if the intelligent reader thinks a little, he will find that it conveys no meaning. *va yeeleke* is one word, i.e. *departed*; but the translators have made three. *Ohaalah*, evidently means *tabernacle*, not *tent*, here. The riches of Abraham were great, they had no occasion to dwell in a tent. Besides it is said that Abraham dwelt at Mamre near Hebron, ch. xxxv. where this tabernacle, or place of public worship, was. And there Isaac brought Rebekah to the tabernacle of his mother, until they were married.

6 Except to the sons of the concubines who were by Abraham; Abraham gave gifts: and he sent them from before Isaac his son, while he yet lived; eastward, to the land of the east.

7 Now these were the days, of the years of the life of Abraham, that he lived: a hundred seventy, and five years.

8 So he expired, thus died Abraham, in old age, a prosperous elder, and satisfied: when he was gathered to his people.

9 Then Isaac and Ishmael his sons, buried him, in the cave of Machpelah: in the field of

Ephron the son of Zoar, the Hittite; which is before the front of Mamre.

10 The field which Abraham bought, before the sons of Heth: there Abraham was buried, with Sarah his wife.

11 Moreover it was after the death of Abraham, that God blessed, Isaac his son, when Isaac dwelt by the well Lahai-roi.

12 ¶ Now these were the generations of Ishmael, the son of Abraham, whom Hagar the Egyptian, maiden of Sarah, bare to Abraham.

13 And these were the names of the sons of Ishmael, with their names according to their

NOTES ON CHAP. XXV.

6. *To the land of the east.* That is, Persia, India, and China. It is said by the most ancient profane historians, that Abraham sent missionaries to all the eastern nations, to teach them the worship of the true God. The Persians believe that their *Soph*, or book of wisdom, was written by him. The Brahmins, (which word is a transposition of the letters of the name Abraham) say that he was the great father, as the word signifies; and that a great part of their theology was given by him. It may also be seen in the translation of one of the Chinese books, held in great estimation among them, that the creation, the coming of Christ, and the last state of things, are in many parts precisely the same in sense as the sacred scripture. From which circumstance, though the inspired writer has not plainly said so, it appears, that when the patriarch sent his sons to the east, they were commissioned to instruct those nations concerning the origin of the world, the coming of Messiah, and the final state of things.

8. *Then Abraham gave up the ghost and died.* In the authorized version we are told twice in this verse, that Abraham died; and three times that he was an old man. But it must be evident to the learned and to the intelligent reader, that the word of God does not contain useless repetitions. The word *vayigang*, rendered *then he gave up the ghost*; means, to be employed in a very laborious work, to take great pains in order to bring about a better state of things, in consequence of which, to be weary, and exhausted. Josh. xxiv. 13, *ye laboured not*; Isa. xlvii. 12, *thou hast laboured*;—xii. 6;—lvii. 10.—Besides, the verb *yigang*, rendered, *gave up the ghost*, is one word, and certainly a verb and a noun cannot be signified by the same word; to say nothing of the words *up* and *the*; which are all crowded in, though there is not any authority for a single word so chosen. This word is written in the pluperfect tense, and rendered in the new translation, *thus Abraham had laboured*, viz. from the time he was called from Ur of the Chaldees, to establish the worship of the true God.

But the remaining part of the first proposition, is altogether also out of order: *בשעה טובה וקטנה baseebah tobah saaken vesaabeeng* is translated thus in the common version: *in a good old age, an old man, and full of years*. No person of common education, in this age, could possibly be guilty of making such needless repetitions; it was certainly sufficient for us to be told once, that Abraham was old, according to the estimation at that time, and not thrice, as in the authorized version.

טובה tobah, means *good, fine, well, fairer, better, welfare, goodly, prosperity*; according to idiom, Gen. xv. 15; Ezra viii.

27; Jud. ix. 16;—xv. 2; 2 Sam. xvii. 14; Josh. vii. 21; Eccles. vii. 14. *ip saaken*, cannot be rendered by the words *an old man*, in any part of scripture; there is not any article, neither does the word for *man* occur in the verse; though it is made a part of the text. This word in its singular form literally means an *elder*, a governor in the town, or in the church of God. Deut. xxv. 7, *go up unto the elders*; Joel i. 14, *gather ye the elders*; Isa. iii. 2, *and the ancient*, or *elder*, as it should be rendered, for it is plain that the governors in the army, the man of war; of the city, the mighty man; of the law, the judge; of the church, the prophet; and for the civil order of the church, the ancient, or *elder*, are all introduced in this verse.

בשעה vesaabeeng, can have no such rendering as *full of years*. This vowel form of the word is not rendered by *full* in any part of scripture; nor is there any authority for the words, *of years*. The word from this root which can with any propriety be translated to mean *full*, in the preter is *saabang*, which is a different word from *saabeeng*; 1 Chron. xxiii. 1, *and full of days*; but in such case it must necessarily be connected with a noun either of time or substance; which is not the case as to the word before us. This word literally means to be satisfied, resigned, contented.

And was gathered unto his people. Objectors have said, that the writings of Moses do not say any thing concerning a future state. But were this passage attentively read by them, they would be obliged to acknowledge their error. Abraham, as to his mortal body, was not gathered to his people; he was a Chaldean, and his ancestors were buried in his native place in Chaldea; thus it plainly means that the soul of Abraham was gathered to those just men the patriarchs, who in succession had taught the people to worship God; who had like him received the divine commands from the mercy-seat; also to all those who had departed in the true faith: hence the propriety of the expression, *and was gathered unto his people*.

10. *Purchased of the sons of Heth.* He did not purchase the land of the sons of Heth, but of Ephron the Hittite. The *אח eth*, reads, *before*; viz. *before the sons of Heth*.

13. 16. We have here the names of the descendants of Ishmael, twelve in number; and we are informed that they were princes or governors of all that part of the country, which had been allotted to Ishmael, contiguous to the possessions of Isaac. This, as was noticed, shews that the patriarch provided in the most liberal manner for all his children; consequently the objection advanced against the conduct of Abraham in not providing for Hagar and Ishmael, is founded in error and ignorance.

generations; the first-born of Ishmael, Nabajoth; and Kedar and Adbeel, and Mibram,

14 And Mishma and Dumah, and Massa,

15 Hadar and Tema, Jeter, Naphish, and Kedemah.

16 These were the sons of Ishmael, and these their names; for their towns, and for their castles: twelve princes, of their people.

17 Moreover these were the years of the life of Ishmael; a hundred and thirty, and seven years: when he expired, so he died, and he was gathered to his people.

18 Thus they dwelt from Havilah to Shur, which is before the front of Egypt, in going to Assyria: he spread in the presence of all his brethren.

19 ¶ Now these were the generations of Isaac, the son of Abraham: Abraham begat Isaac.

20 ¶ And Isaac was forty years old, when he took Rebekah, daughter of Bethuel, the Aramite, from Padan Aram; the sister of Laban the Aramite, to him for a wife.

17. *Gave up the ghost, and died.* I have noticed this expression in the 8th verse. The verb נָפַח נַפְשׁוֹ *vayig'ang*, means to labour, to faint, to be exhausted, spent. The sacred writer connects it with נָפַח *zaaken*, an elder in the church; but in this verse he is silent respecting Ishmael's having anything to do with the true worship of God: so that he appears to use the word with a different mode of expression, consistently with the root. I have therefore rendered it to faint, to be exhausted; for Ishmael did not labour as an elder; did not weary, or exhaust himself in establishing the true worship of God.

18. *He died in the presence of all his brethren.* This is by no means the true reading, nor does it refer to any thing of the kind. We have been told in the 17th verse, that he gave up the ghost and died; therefore there was no necessity to be told again that he died. נָפַח *naphaal*, which is rendered, in the common version, died, and which is applied to Ishmael; is applied by Moses to the possessions that had fallen to, or were given by Abraham to Ishmael. The word is used to mean an inheritance which falls to a person; to divide by lot. See Psalm xvi. 6; Josh. xiii. 4, Behold I have divided unto you by lot. It also means to spread along, Jud. vii. 13;—ver. 12, The Midianites lay in the valley. Heb. spread in the valley. Onkelos renders it, נָפַח מִן כָּל אֶחָיו *by g'nal aphee kal achouhi sera*, In the presence of his brethren he ruled, that is, he spread, he increased. Now as in the preceding verse the extreme boundaries of the possessions of Ishmael are described, he says, He spread in the presence of his brethren; viz. in the lifetime of Abraham, to prevent any strife after his death.

20. *Laban the Syrian.* This word Syrian has been adopted by the translators, instead of the Hebrew word Aramite; which was continued in our English bibles to the time of Elizabeth. I have given the word as it is in the original.

21. *And Isaac intreated.* The verb is in the pluperfect tense, he had supplicated till his prayer was answered.

22. *To inquire of the Lord.* At the sanctuary by the offici-

21 Moreover Isaac had prayed before JEHOVAH for his wife, because she was barren; and he prevailed before JEHOVAH; for Rebekah his wife conceived.

22 Now the children bruised themselves within her; and she said, If so; why am I thus? then she went to enquire before JEHOVAH.

23 And JEHOVAH answered concerning her, Two nations are in thy womb; thus two people, from thy bowels shall be separated; but one will strive against the other; but the elder shall serve the younger.

24 When the days of her delivery, were fulfilled: for behold twins, were in her womb;

25 Then the first came forth ruddy, all over him, like a garment of hair; and they called his name, Esau.

26 And afterwards, this his brother came forth, with his hand taking hold of the heel of Esau; therefore he called his name, Jacob: thus Isaac was sixty years old, when she bare them.

27 Now the youths had grown; and Esau

ating priest who stood before the Cherubim. But it seems by this mode of expression as if God spake to the woman. Too little attention has been given to the words עֲמָנָה נָשִׁי *vayomer Elohim*, and God said. We are not to suppose, as has been supposed by some, that these answers were given from God (as I have, and shall frequently have occasion to observe) to individuals themselves; let the reader always keep in mind this fact, that God had from the beginning graciously given man an opportunity of knowing his will when any thing of a peculiar nature occurred, which inquiry was always made by the person who officiated in the priestly office (as observed); that is, those who were approved and chosen of God; hence they were properly called the Lord's anointed.

To enquire of the Lord. Heb. to enquire before Jehovah.

23. *And the Lord said unto her.* The word נָא *laah*, literally reads here, concerning her. No communication being given but in the way which was appointed, to the officiating priest in his tabernacle, it will appear that the translation which says this communication was delivered to the woman by the Lord, is not correct. That it was delivered to her by the priest, therefore is evident; consequently the word נָא *laah*, with the above rendering of the preposition לָאָה *lamed*, as in other parts of scripture, supports the dignity of that divine order which God had established from the beginning, for his intercourse with man.

25. *Called his name, Esau, i. e. Ruddy.*

26. *Called his name, Jacob, i. e. The Supplanter.*

27. *And the boys grew.* This is as it stands in the common version; but I do not need to inform the intelligent reader, that this rendering is improper, because it is unmeaning and unnecessary to say the boys grew; it was a natural consequence, no one could doubt it, if they lived: therefore the sacred writer could not make such a remark. This rendering has been made by a total neglect of the tense; the verb נָשִׁי *vayig'delon*, is in the pluperfect, or remote preter time, and should

was a knowing provider, a man of the field: and Jacob an upright man, he inhabited tabernacles.

28 Moreover Isaac loved Esau, because a provider according to his command; but Rebekah loved Jacob.

29 Then Jacob prepared a repast; when Esau came from the field, for he was weary.

have been rendered as in the new translation, *had grown*; viz. had arrived at manhood.

And Esau was a cunning hunter. See following verse.

A plain man dwelling in tents. From the original Hebrew we learn that Esau had approved of the idolatrous worship of the land, which at this period had become general over all the east; and therefore he was not a proper person to succeed his father, as the representative head of the true church of God. But in the common version it is said, Jacob was a *plain man*; *וְיַעֲקֹב אִישׁ יָשָׁר*, certainly cannot be so translated; the clause has no determinate meaning; these words are thus literally rendered, *a man upright*. Esau no doubt was an upright man in his dealings between man and man. But the above words in the original were also used by the sacred writer to signify the idolatry of Esau, by showing that he was not *upright*, as to the first great essential command God had given, to worship him.

Dwelling in tents. Much injury has been done to the religion of the bible by many well-meaning commentators, who have represented the patriarchs as persons of little account, as wanderers, having no settled habitation. If dignity or riches will give any additional force or beauty to truth, I have before given proof from scripture, that they were esteemed as princes in the lands wherever they went, and that they abounded in riches. This rendering in the vulgar version leads the mind to conclude that Jacob was a person of the former description. But as the words *וְיַעֲקֹב אִישׁ יָשָׁר*, an *upright man*, mean that he was a worshipper of the true God, so the word *וְיַעֲקֹב אִישׁ יָשָׁר* rendered *tents*, when connected with the worship of God, as in this verse, means *tabernacles*, for the public worship of God; see on ch. xviii. 1. Thus he dwelt in tabernacles, which was the custom of this ancient priesthood; and which was continued under the Mosaic dispensation; he was the head of the true church of God, to which office he succeeded on the deflection of Esau.

28. *Because he did eat of his venison.* The translation of this proposition is only a comment; there is no authority for the words, *he did eat*. Besides, the very same word in the preceding verse, which is translated by *hunter*; and so applied to the man, surely cannot be applied in this verse to mean *venison*.

The word *וַיִּשָּׂא*, rendered here *hunter*, means to *take*, *pursue*, *procure*, *provide*, *lie in wait*, agreeably to idiom and the intention of the writer, see ch. x. 9. That the above is the radical meaning of the word, see ch. xxvii. 39, *taken*; Lam. iii. 52; Psa. cxi. 11, *evil shall hunt (pursue) him*; so in the infinitive, Ezek. xiii. 18, *to hunt (pursue)*; Jer. xvi. 16, *hunters*, (i.e. pursuers,) *and they shall hunt (pursue) them*.

The following word, *וְיַעֲקֹב אִישׁ יָשָׁר*, which is in the common version rendered *because he did eat*, has a different meaning and application. This word literally signifies *his commandment*; see the very same word, both consonants and vowels, Num. xxvii. 21, *at his word*; Prov. viii. 29, *his commandment*; Gen. xli. 40, *thy word*; Josh. i. 18, *thy commandment*; Job xxxix. 27, *thy command*;—xxxiii. 6, *thy wish*.

30 Because Esau had said to Jacob, Supply me now with the red repast, for I am weary: therefore he called his name Edom.

31 So Jacob said; Sell this day thy birthright to me.

32 And Esau answered; Behold, I am going to die: therefore what is this birthright to me?

33 Then Jacob said, Swear it before me this

Another liberty has been taken here: the *i* *ou*, which is postfixed to *וַיִּשָּׂא*, is the pronoun possessive, but it is in the common version taken and put to *וַיִּשָּׂא* *tsayid*, and so translated *his venison*. I have therefore rendered this clause as the words are rendered in other parts of scripture, by which we have a consistent reading. Things so truly unimportant as Esau's being a *cunning hunter*, and of being loved by Isaac, *because he ate of his venison*, could not have been communicated for the information of posterity. And it must appear from such a statement, there is nothing that points out its sanctity. On the other hand, by the new translation we have a sacred and dignified view of the divine order of things established in all the patriarchal churches by the sacrificial worship, as typical of the coming of the Messiah, the Redeemer.

29. *Sod pottage*, *וַיִּשָּׂא* *sa yauzed*, reads, *and he boiled*; and *וַיִּשָּׂא* *saazid*, a sacred repast, an offering made of the fruits of the ground.

30. *Feed me I pray thee with that same red pottage.* According to all the European versions, Esau sells his birthright for this *red, red*; or, as it is rendered, *that same red pottage*. Many ingenious comments have been given to prove, that this pottage was made of something which gave it that red colour; while others have concluded that Esau was a voluptuous man, and preferred the gratification of his appetite to his birthright. On diligently examining the original, I am constrained to reject all such unfounded applications, as being altogether opposed to the obvious application of the sacred writer.

The word *וַיִּשָּׂא* *halgniteeni*, is rendered *feed me*. But this word cannot be thus understood, it is only translated so in this passage; for in no part of scripture is it ever rendered to *satisfy hunger*. This application induced me first to suspect, that the translators had not comprehended the meaning of the sacred writer in his application of this passage.

This word may be applied according to the meaning of any of the words which signify to *take in*, *receive*, *absorb*, *appropriate*, *sink*, *engulf*, *incorporate*, *supply*. But it is never used signifying in order to *satisfy hunger*. And therefore the word *supply*, is the most proper word according to idiom, by which this word can be translated, preserving the meaning of the sacred writer.

The true application of the following words, *מִן הָאָדָם הָאָדָם* *min ha Adom, ha Adom haxeh*, have been also mistaken by the translators; they are rendered thus, *with this same red pottage*. And thus they are applied in the common version to this repast as satisfying the appetite of Esau. A little consideration would have convinced the translators, that this could not be the case. It was not, as has been understood, a bartering away his birthright, or the priesthood, for a mess of pottage! Esau had a princely establishment, was rich in flocks and herds; indeed he was a man of such consequence, that when he removed to Seir with all his people, all his cattle, and all his substance, which is stated to have been so exceedingly great that the land could not support them to dwell together, ch. xxxvi. 6, 7, it gave

thy posterity; all the nations of the earth shall bless themselves.

5 A reward, for Abraham hearkened, to my voice: yea he hath kept mine ordinances, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws.

6 So Isaac dwelt, in Gerar.

7 Now the men of the place had asked him, concerning his wife; and he said, She is my sister: for he feared to say my wife; because, the men of the place will slay me for Rebekah; for she was of a beautiful aspect.

8 Now it was when he had been a long time there, that Abimelech king of the Philistines, looked from a window: when he saw, and behold, Isaac was playing, with Rebekah his wife.

9 Then Abimelech called for Isaac, and he said, Behold, surely she is thy wife; and how saidst thou, she is my sister? so Isaac said to him; Because I thought, perhaps I shall die, for her.

reader will always keep in mind, that the Hebrews who worshipped the one true God, were brought out of Egypt to break in pieces the idols, and to abolish the idolatry of the land of Canaan; and therefore they are constantly told of this by the sacred writer. This word *ban ha el*, therefore, which the translators have rendered by *these*, means in every part of scripture *the god*; see on ch. xix. 8. The clause then reads, *all the countries of the god*. Thus we find that idolatry, and the abominable evils which were sanctioned under the semblance of religion, were the ostensible causes of the subversion of the governments of those countries.

4. *And will give to thy seed all these countries.* In the preceding verse of the common version, we have *give*, the first person singular future, *I will give*; but it must appear that there was no necessity for Isaac to be told in the 3d verse, *to thy seed I will give all these countries*, and then again to be told in the next verse, in the very same words, *to thy seed I will give all these countries*. Such a needless repetition is chargeable only on the translators. The sacred writer introduces a fresh subject in this proposition, viz. *I will multiply thy posterity as the stars of the heaven*. In the common version, Isaac is not told when this vast multiplication of his posterity was to take place; but in the original, the *when* is prefixed to *naathii*, which has been improperly translated by the conjunction copulative *and*, is adverbial, and is to be translated by *when*. This removes the objection to the useless repetition, and points out the period when this promise was to be fulfilled, viz. *when I give to thy posterity*: which was accomplished when his posterity came out of Egypt; they received these lands, and became a great nation.

7. *And he said, She is my sister.* Objectors have said, that Isaac told a wilful lie; a modern commentator unwisely says the same, and contends that it was not a parallel case with that of Abraham, ch. xii. 2. But surely no person understanding the customs of these ancient people would venture to accuse the patriarch of lying. Abraham chose the descendant of his brother for Isaac, and in all such cases that degree of relationship was commonly kept up among them as we find throughout the scripture. Lot is called the brother of Abraham though

10 Moreover Abimelech said; Why hast thou done this before us? if lightly one of the people had lien with thy wife; then thou hadst brought upon us, a trespass.

11 And Abimelech commanded, even all the people saying; He that smiteth this man, or his wife, shall surely die.

12 Now Isaac sowed in the land, and he received in the same year, a hundred fold: for JEHOVAH blessed him.

13 Thus the man increased, yea he went onward and prospered; till he became exceeding great.

14 For he had possessions of sheep, and possessions of herds; also a multitude of servants: and the Philistines envied him.

15 Moreover all the wells, which the servants of his father had digged, in the days of Abraham his father; the Philistines had stopped, and filled them with dust.

he was the son of his brother: and Laban called Jacob his brother though he was the son of his sister. Abraham and Nahor married the sisters Sarah and Milcah, and Isaac married the daughter of Bethuel the son of Nahor. So that this relationship is always acknowledged without any violence to truth. Also we find that those who belonged to the same tribe were always distinguished by the title of brother and sister, Exod. xxxii. 27; Levit. xiv. 25.

10. *What is this that thou hast done?* This must appear to the reader as a very improper question: Abimelech knew what Isaac had done, for he had told him in the preceding verse, which perfectly satisfied the king; therefore he could not ask this question. Heb. *Why hast thou done this before us?* From which we may learn that this people did not injure strangers who were in friendship with them, as the subsequent conduct of Abimelech shews; but those who were enemies, who were at war with them; and such could not expect any favour in their country. This also shews us that the character of this people was not of that description which commentators in general have supposed; for in the case of Abraham, (as above) Abimelech appears to have been a man who feared and worshipped God, and he shews his people in the next verse that the friendly stranger is to be protected: *he that smiteth this man, or his wife, also shall be put to death*.

13. This verse in the common version is very awkwardly translated; the verb *yigdeel*, occurs thrice, which is rendered *grew great*; one of these words must be unnecessary, as the verb and adjective cannot be expressed in one word. It refers to the substance he had acquired as mentioned in the preceding verse: therefore it should have been rendered *thus the man increased*, viz. in this manner, in substance.

The same word, which is the third person singular, is rendered *he grew*; this is indefinite; we are not told in the common version whether it applies to quality or quantity: but as it is written with the same vowels, the translators should have recollected that it must have the same meaning and application in the orderly progression of his increasing wealth; and should with the *when* prefixed, which is adverbial, be rendered, *yea he prospered*.

16 Then Abimelech said, to Isaac; Go from us, for thou art much mightier than him.

17 So Isaac departed from thence, and he pitched in the valley of Gerar, and dwelt there.

18 Where Isaac continued, and he digged the springs of water, which they had digged in the days of Abraham his father; for the Philistines had stopped them, after the death of Abraham: and he called their names, after the names that his father had called them.

19 Also the servants of Isaac digged in the valley, and they found there a well of springing water.

20 Then the shepherds of Gerar, strove with the shepherds of Isaac, saying, The water is for us; and he called the name of the well, Esek, because they strove with him.

21 Moreover they digged another well, and they strove for that also; and he called the name of it, Sitnah.

22 Therefore he removed from thence, and he digged another well; but for it they strove not: and he called the name of it Rehoboth; for he said, Because now JEHOVAH hath made room for us, and we shall be fruitful in the land.

23 So he went from thence, to Beer-sheba.

24 Then JEHOVAH appeared to him that night; and he said, I am the God of Abraham thy father: fear thou not, for I am with thee, thus I will bless thee, and I will multiply thy posterity in the cause of Abraham my servant.

25 Moreover he built there an altar, and he preached in the name of JEHOVAH, for he pitched

there his tabernacle; and there the servants of Isaac, digged a well.

26 Now Abimelech went to him, from Gerar, with Ahuzzah his friend, and Phicol, the captain of his host:

27 Then Isaac said to them; Why come ye to me, knowing that ye hate me, and have sent me from among you?

28 And they said, We surely saw, that JEHOVAH was with thee; therefore we said, There shall be now an oath between us, and thee: thus we will make a covenant with thee.

29 If thou wilt procure supply before us, as we have not injured thee, even as we have done to thee only good; and have sent thee in peace: thou therefore art blessed of JEHOVAH.

30 Then he made a feast for them; and they ate and drank.

31 So they rose in the morning, and swore each to the other: then Isaac sent them forth, and they departed from him, in peace.

32 Moreover it was the same day, that the servants of Isaac came, and told him, concerning the flowing well, which they had digged; and they said to him, We have found water.

33 And he called it, Shebah: therefore the name of it is Beer-sheba, to this day.

34 ¶ Now Esau was forty years old, when he took a woman, Judith the daughter of Beri, the Hittite: and Bashemath, the daughter of Elon, the Hittite.

35 Which were a grief of mind, to Isaac, and to Rehekah.

Thirdly, we have the same radical word with a variation in the orthography, גָּדַל *gaadal*, great, and means his authority, the esteem in which he was held.

16. *Much mightier than us*. On this word I have said, we cannot suppose that Isaac was mightier than the king of the Philistines, and that this word upon *mimenou*, refers to the preceding verse concerning Abraham. And with the same construction, Psa. lxi. 1; Esth. v. 9; Jer. xxxviii. 27; Psa. xxii. 23; is necessarily translated as the oblique case of the third person singular, viz. *him*.

18. The word גָּשָׁא *yaashaab* is not noticed in the common version; it is necessary to a true understanding of the verse. גָּשָׁא *Yaashaab*, means to *dwelt*; and this vowel form of the verb signifies that he continued there a considerable time; see 1 Chron. v. 9.

20. *Esek*. This word means *oppression*; and might be so translated in the text.

28. *The Lord was with thee*. Thus they owned him to be a prophet, or preacher of the true God. From which we also learn, that this people, at that period, had begun to entertain higher views of the true worship of God, as taught by Isaac, than has been supposed.

29. *That thou wilt do us no hurt*. נִרְרִי *raagnaah*, is translated *hurt*, but this vowel form of the word has no such meaning in scripture. It signifies to feed, Jer. l. 19; Ezek. xxiv. 23, *he shall feed*; Mich. v. 4, *and feed*; so that the translators have mistaken the meaning; for it cannot be supposed that Abimelech, the king of a nation who had ordered Isaac to quit his dominions, could entertain any fear that he could do them any injury in a national point of view. Isaac was a patriarchal shepherd prince, and Abimelech wished to keep up a friendly intercourse with him, in order that when there was a scarcity, as was frequently the case in dry seasons, he might feed them, viz. supply them with sheep and cattle.

נִרְרִי *Thagnaaseh* is rendered *do*, viz. *do us no hurt*; but, preserving the idiom of the verb, it should be translated with the same meaning, as in Jer. ii. 17, *to procure*. Neither is *וְאִם* *im*, a negative in this clause; it is a conditional particle, as must be obvious from the tenor of the preceding verse, and should be rendered as it is in Deut. viii. 19, *if*; Jud. iv. 8. So that if the last clause of the preceding verse be read with this first clause of the 29th verse, it will confirm this translation, viz. Thus we will make a covenant with thee—if thou wilt feed us.

CHAP. XXVII.

NOW it was when Isaac was old, and his eyes were restrained from seeing; that he called for Esau, his eldest son, and he said to him, My son; and he said to him, Behold here am I.

2 Then he said, Behold now, I am old; I know not the day of my dying.

NOTES ON CHAP. XXVII.

4. And make me savoury meat. *vagnaseeh*, rendered *make*, has the same meaning and application that it has in Numb. viii. 12, and offer. Thus Isaac says, and offer for me. Agreeably to the custom, the firstborn succeeded to the priesthood. Isaac at this period was about to confirm it on Esau.

Savoury meat. The word *metegnamim*, is in the common version rendered *savoury meat*; this form of the word is not met with in any other part of scripture; besides, it is not a compound word, and cannot be translated by the words *savoury meat*. There can be no doubt but that it means to *distinguish intellectually*; that which appertains to the mind. It also means, in its radix, to taste literally; and as it is a most important matter to determine the true meaning and application of this word, which will lead us to the establishment of the sacrificial worship at the death of Isaac, I shall refer the reader to the passages where it is applied in both senses, by which he will be satisfied as to the application of the passage under consideration.

1 Sam. xxi. 13, *tagnamo*, his behaviour; Prov. xi. 22; —xxvi. 16, discretion; —xxxi. 18, perceiveth; Psa. xxxiv. 8. *tagnamou*, taste (understand) and see that the Lord is good. Job xii. 20, *tagnam*, the understanding, ch. vi. 6, or is there any *tagnam*, taste in the white of an egg. I must make a digression here, to shew that this word in Job, as well as the whole passage, is not the sense of the original. The word *chalaamuth*, is rendered by egg; but this word means a dream, in every part of scripture. And the word *beris*, which is also rendered, according to this view, in the white; literally means to run, progression: see Lev. xv. 3; so that, whether this word *beris*, in Job, be taken under the root *rir*, or *barar*, it conveys the same idea. But certainly the same radix cannot mean to run, and also the white of an egg. Therefore the word *tagnam*, here applies to that which is repeated, and should be translated as the same word is, ch. xii. 20, the understanding, or Psa. cxix. 66, judgment. The clause will then truly read, or is understanding in the progress of a dream?

This word is also applied to the literal taste in eating, 1 Sam. xiv. 24; Job xii. 11; Jon. iii. 7; Numb. xi. 8. This is the sense in which it is used by Isaac; it means the sacramental typical repasts, which were first offered *l'pne Jehovah*, in the presence of Jehovah, viz. at the altar; see ver. 7. And this offering was what was meant by the words, such as I love; otherwise the following words, that my soul may bless thee before I die, would have been altogether unmeaning had they not related to the blessing at the confirmation of the priesthood; which was then to pass to the successor at the death of Isaac.

That my soul may bless thee. From the obvious meaning of this verse we can to a certainty conclude, that something more was intended to be conveyed to posterity than that of Isaac's eating venison; because in the last clause it is said (and which appears in the common version to be in consequence of his eating venison) that my soul may bless thee before I die. But it is

3 Therefore now take I pray thee thy weapons, thy quiver, and thy bow; then go forth to the field, and procure for me, provision.

4 And offer before me, the repasts, such as I loved, then bring it before me, and I will eat; for this cause, my soul shall bless thee, before I die.

evident that his blessing either Esau or Jacob did not depend on his eating venison; he could have blessed them without this repast, had there not been something more comprehended by these words. Objectors have not been sparing in their remarks on this part of scripture, because it has appeared to them strange that a man, nearly at the time of his death, should call for venison, that he might be enabled to bless his son before his death. So must every intelligent reader of the history be of the same opinion; for had this been the case, where must we have looked for the sanctity of this part of scripture? I trust that the following remarks will convince all skepticks, that the generally received opinion is not consistent with the sacred record in the original Hebrew; and that instead of simply eating, that he might bless his son before his death, he ordered him to prepare for one of the most solemn of all ordinances, viz. the ordinance ordained from the beginning, when the firstlings of the flock were brought as an offering to God; the holy paschal offering.

The word *bagnabour*, is not noticed in the common version, and the *beth*, prefixed to this word, is rendered by that. It is however one of the most important words in the whole verse, as it shews that this repast was a solemn sacrifice instituted from the fall, and representative of the great passover sacrifice at the coming of Messiah; which was so understood by the patriarch: and also of the passing over to his successor the right of primogeniture, which embraced the office of the high priest as representative of the Messiah.

This word with the prefix *beth*, gives the reason or cause of an effect which must be understood of the connection of the cause with the effect, or the immediate transition or passage from the cause to the effect; assigning a reason for the action, comprehended in the preceding verb, viz. *okeelah*, I will eat; that is, by eating of the sacrificial repast: for this reason he declares, My soul shall bless thee before I die.

That this word means the entering into a covenant, is obvious; it is the primary meaning of the root, see Gen. xv. 17, pass between the pieces; Jer. xxx. 18, and passed between the parts; 2 Sam. xii. 13, The Lord hath put away, (Heb. passed over) thy sin; Prov. xix. 2, to pass over a transgression; Exod. xii. 12, I will pass through (Heb. over) the land of Egypt; Mich. vii. 18, and passeth by (Heb. over) the transgression; Numb. xxi. 23, to pass; Jud. xi. 19, pass over; Prov. xix. 11, went further; Numb. xx. 26, pass; Amos vii. 8; —viii. 2, go beyond; Numb. xxii. 18, pass over; Jud. iii. 28, were passing over; Isa. li. 10, to pass over; Deut. xvii. 2, in transgressing (Heb. to pass.) See also where this word is in full construction, Josh. iv. 1, *gnabar*, to pass over; —Josh. iii. 17. In the common version the words *passed over*, are repeated, though in the Hebrew these words are different: but thus it means, that the priests stood with the ark in the midst of Jordan, for the people to pass over; 2 Sam. xv. 24, *gnabar*, passing; 1 Sam. xiv. 4, to go over (Heb. to pass.) Neh. iii. 14, to pass; Jer. xli. 17, to go over (Heb. to pass;) Ezek. xlvii. 5, pass over. This word with the *beth* prefixed, truly reads, because, or for this

5 Now Rebekah heard, when Isaac spake to Esau, his son; so Esau went to the field, to procure provision, to bring it.

6 Then Rebekah conversed, with Jacob her son, saying: Behold, I have heard thy father, speaking to Esau thy brother, saying;

7 Bring to me provision, and prepare for me the repast, and I will eat: then I will bless thee in the presence of JEHOVAH, before my death.

8 Therefore now my son, hearken to my voice, concerning what I appoint with thee;

cause. Some are of opinion that this word is derived from Eber the patriarch, who preached and taught the passover by the sacrifice which God had ordained; and so it was given to Abraham by the Canaanites, Gen. xiv. 13, *Abraham the Hebrew*, viz. the *passover-man*, or the man who preaches the *passover* by sacrifice. There certainly can be no objection to this use of the word, as we find it applied in this sense by God to Adam, as above.

From all which it appears that this preparation ordered by Isaac for a repast, was not, as we have supposed according to the authorized version, a mere gratification of the sense of taste, or to allay his hunger, a most unlikely conclusion for a man in dying circumstances; but that it was a *sacred repast*, as observed by Adam, Abel, and the patriarchs down to the time of Abraham; and finally with the right of primogeniture, passed over by Isaac to his successor. All this is plain from the words, *For this cause my soul shall bless thee before I die.* See below on the 9th verse.

7. *Before the Lord.* לִפְנֵי יְהוָה *lipnee Jehovah*, literally reads, *in the presence of Jehovah*. From which we learn, that this sacred *passover* was observed in the שְׁחָטָן *shechatan*, in the holy place, before the Cherubim; which is always emphatically called: *in the presence of Jehovah*. Otherwise the expression, *in the presence of Jehovah*, would have been unnecessary. Some have supposed that no church had appeared before the time of Moses; but the reader will remember, that the true worship of God had been established by Abraham and Isaac; the people had been convinced that the doctrines preached by them were true, and had been converted to the faith. For, as before observed, altars and tabernacles had been built by them in every part of the land. In short, God always had, and always will have, a church on earth; even while in the ark the true worship was preserved; as we have seen, that he commanded a mercy-seat to be made, and an altar for atonement. See ch. vii. 14.

9. *Two goat kids of the goats.* This circumstance of taking *two kids*, will also lead us to the true meaning of this part of the narrative; for had not something more been understood than Jacob's merely eating, surely one kid would have been more than sufficient for one man.

It should be remembered, that in this book the various particulars of the *rites and ceremonies* are not recorded; these are introduced in the book of Leviticus, where every circumstance and thing, even the whole order of the offerings, are particularly mentioned. For though the *offerings, sacrifices, rites, ceremonies, statutes, ordinances, and laws*, were always the same from the beginning and passed from the patriarchal churches to the time of Abraham; kept and observed by his descendants in Egypt; and finally promulgated in the land of Canaan: yet the sacred writer did not inform us (nor was it necessary) concerning the formula of their worship. Nevertheless, we have

9 Go now to the flock, and fetch for me from thence, two good kids of the goats; and I will provide with them, the repasts for thy father, such as he loveth;

10 Then thou shalt bring it to thy father, and he will eat: for this cause there he will bless thee, before his death.

11 But Jacob said, to Rebekah, his mother: Behold Esau my brother is a hairy man; but I am a smooth man.

12 Perhaps my father will feel me, then I

sufficient information given to show that the same order existed: *Abel brought the firstlings of his flock*; *Nadab* built an altar before Jehovah, and offered of every clean beast; and Abraham was commanded to offer also of every creature allowed to be offered.

In the passage before us Jacob was told to bring *two kids of the goats*: if the reader will turn to Exod. xxix. 38, he will find that *two lambs* were always to be offered on the altar every day. And it is worthy of notice, that they were to be כִּזְבִּים *kababim*, *he-lambs*. See also Lev. xiv. 10. שְׁנֵי כִזְבִּים *shenee kababim*, i. e. *two he-lambs*: one was to be for a trespass-offering, ver. 12, the other for a burnt-offering, ver. 19. This will account for the two kids which were brought by Jacob, at the request of Rebekah; they were שְׁנֵי כִזְבִּים *shenee kababim*, the one for a trespass-offering, the other for a burnt-offering; agreeably to the divine command: both referring to the Messiah, in whom, and by whom, the offerings were to cease for ever; who was to be the trespass-offering for justification, and the burnt-offering, the propitiation, for acceptance before the mercy-seat. Accordingly it is said in the 7th verse, that he would bless Jacob by *passing over* the priesthood, and confirming it on him; see ver. 4. And therefore he said, לִפְנֵי יְהוָה *lipnee Jehovah*, i. e. *in the presence of Jehovah*: that was, before the altar, here so called, because they were considered as being more immediately there, in the presence of God.

And I will make them savoury meat. The reader must turn to the 4th verse for the meaning of the word מִטֶּגֶן *metegannim*, rendered by *savoury-meat*. The word refers to the two offerings, viz. the trespass-offering, and the burnt-offering. And in conformity with this, מִמֶּנּוּ *minenu* prefixed, should be translated by the word *both*, viz. *both repasts*; as with the same construction it is so translated in other parts of scripture.

10. *That he may eat, and that he may bless thee.* Twice in this clause the subjunctive mood is introduced, which, as observed, does not exist in the language; nor is there any necessity for it: therefore the word *may* is evidently improper. The same error is also made here that I have noticed in the 4th verse. גִּבּוֹר *gnabur*, is omitted in the common version, and instead of which the בֵּת *beth* prefixed, is rendered by *that*. But, as was observed, this word means the cause passing into the effect, even the *passover* instituted at the fall, the *passover offering*, the two lambs for the trespass offering, and for the burnt offering, (as above) represent the Messiah, who in the fulness of time was to be manifested, for the redemption of man. And therefore the בֵּת *beth* prefixed to גִּבּוֹר *gnabur*, i. e. the passing of the thing in question, being connected with future time, when Jacob was to be blessed, reads, *for*, viz. *for this cause*: when the priesthood was to pass over, to be confirmed on him, in the holy place, in the presence of Jehovah, as above.

shall be in his eyes, as a deceiver; and I shall bring a curse upon me, and not a blessing.

13 But his mother said to him, Upon me be thy curse, my son; only hearken to my voice, now go, take for me.

14 Then he departed and took them; which he brought to his mother; and his mother prepared the repasts; such as his father loved.

15 Then Rebekah took the garments of Esau her eldest son, which were with her, in the house; and she clothed Jacob, her youngest son.

15. *And Rebekah took goodly raiment of her eldest son Esau.*

This passage is highly interesting as it stands in the original, but in the common version the words *goodly raiment* give us no information. By the true translation of the word *חמדות* *ha chamudoth*, which the translators have rendered *goodly*, we shall find that this *goodly raiment* consisted of the sacred, or dedicated garments of Esau; who, as the firstborn, was to have succeeded to the priesthood at the death of Isaac.

A little attention to the original will shew, that in almost every place in the common version where the word *chamudoth* is translated *goodly*, it is obviously wrong; for it does not embrace any such meaning. See 2 Chron. xx. 25, *חמדות* *chamudoth*, precious jewels; here the translators have come near to the true meaning of the word. Also in Dan. xi. 8, *their gods with their princes, and with their precious vessels*. Thus it appears that as these vessels were what they considered sacred, so they were the dedicated vessels.

The same is plain in 2 Chron. xxxvi. 10, 19, *goodly vessels of the house of the Lord*; but more properly, *sacred, or, dedicated vessels*; as these vessels were all dedicated or sacred to the service of God.

Again, Cant. v. 16, this word occurs, where the whole verse is as far from the obvious sense of the original, as the sense and application of the whole of that book are from the plain sense of the Hebrew. It reads in the common version thus: *His mouth is most sweet, yea he is altogether lovely*. Objectors have taken great liberties with the Canticles; and it is much to be lamented that there is sufficient ground for their remarks in the common version: many learned, wise, and good men have done rightly in attributing the errors to the first translators after the dispersion of the Jews, when the peculiar phraseology of the language was not at all understood by Christians. But when truly rendered, there is not any thing in the book of Canticles but what is perfectly consistent with the most refined notions we can have of delicacy; and which the reader will see by the true translation of this clause.

חִיכִי *Chiki*, is rendered *his mouth*; but its primary meaning is, *judgment, discernment, discretion*; see radix *חִי* *chik*. Job vi. 30, *cannot my taste*, i. e. (my judgment) *discern perverse things*?—xxxiii. 2, *I have opened my mouth, my tongue hath spoken in my mouth*, i. e. *בְּחִיכִי* *be chiki*, from my judgment. Thus it will be found by a critical examination, that this word refers to the judgment, either to an excess or defect of it, throughout the scripture.

מִמְּתִיקִים *Mamtakim*, is rendered, *most sweet*, which is improper; for the word *sweet* cannot with any propriety be applied but where it affects the palate with that sensation. See Job xxiv. 20, *The worm shall feed sweetly* (delightfully) on him;—xxi. 33, *The clouds of the valley shall be sweet*, (agreeable) unto him; Eccles. v. 12, *The sleep of a labouring man is*

16 Also the skins of kids of the goats, she put upon his hands; and upon the smooth of his neck.

17 Then she gave the repasts, also the bread which she had prepared; into the hand of Jacob her son.

18 So he came to his father, and he said, My father: then he said, Here am I; who art thou my son?

19 And Jacob said to his father, I am Esau thy first-born; I have done accordingly as thou

sweet, (agreeable); Prov. ix. 17, *Stolen waters are sweet*, (agreeable);—xvi. 21, *and the sweetness* (agreement) *of the lips*; xxvii. 9, *so doth the sweetness* (delight) *of a man's friend by hearty counsel*; Eccles. xi. 7, *Truly the light is sweet*, (delightful.)

The next word in this proposition is the same radical word as is used in the verse under consideration, viz. *מְחַמְּדִים* *machmadim*, which the translators have rendered, *altogether lovely*; but in other places, *goodly*, which should be rendered, *sacred, or dedicated*, as is observed above. See also Isa. i. 29, *For they shall be ashamed of the oaks which ye have desired*, (dedicated,) viz. the oaks dedicated to idolatry;—ii. 18, *And upon all the pleasant* (dedicated) *pictures*, viz. the pictures dedicated to the idols. This passage in Canticles will then not read as in the common translation: *His mouth is most sweet, yea he is altogether lovely*; but, *His judgment causeth delight, even altogether sacred*. And this also shews, that the word *חמדות* *ha chamudoth*, which is rendered in the common version, *goodly*, and in connection with *בגדי* *bigdei*, *raiment*, there rendered *goodly raiment*, is literally with the emphatic *ה* *ha*, prefixed, to be truly translated, *Then Rebekah took the dedicated raiment of Esau her eldest son*.

17. *And the bread*—25, *and he brought him wine*. Here we have a confirming proof that this was a SACRED SACRAMENTAL REPAST; for it is evident, as observed, that bread and wine were used in the church of God, from the most ancient times, to signify things of a spiritual nature, applicable to the spiritual states of man. The continual bread offering was to be upon the table in the temple, Numb. iv. 7; bread was used in the sacrifices, ch. xxviii. 2; Melchizedek brought forth bread and wine, Gen. xiv. 18; and the drink offering was to be of wine. Lev. xxiii. 13. This sacrament is retained in Christian churches to the present day.

19. *I am Esau*. I am not of the opinion of a modern commentator, who says that Jacob told a lie; such an incautious writer certainly is not calculated to support the cause of religion and the bible. In the sense which was here understood, both by Rebekah and Jacob, he certainly spake the truth. Those who are bold enough to assert the contrary, should recollect that God was not bound by the blessing of Isaac to accept of Jacob; and it must also appear, that had this not been true in the sense as thus understood by them, God would not have accepted Jacob as the successor of Isaac with a lie in his mouth. Esau, who was by priority of birth to have been at the head of the church, had adopted the Canaanitish worship without sacrifice, in direct opposition to the divine command; and therefore was not a believer in the coming of the Messiah; consequently could not succeed according to the promogeniture, as the representative head of the church of God, to which Isaac had succeeded after Melchizedek. He had relinquished his right, which he had passed over to

hast spoken before me: arise I pray thee, sit, and eat of my provision; then thy soul shall bless me.

20 But Isaac said to his son; How is this that thou hast found it so soon, my son? and he replied, Surely JEHOVAH thy God caused it to be brought before my face.

21 Now Isaac said, to Jacob; Approach I pray thee, for I will feel thee, my son: whether thou be my son Esau, or not.

22 Then Jacob approached to Isaac his father, so he felt him: and he said, The voice is the voice of Jacob; but the hands, hands of Esau.

23 Yet he discerned him not; for his hands

were hairy like the hands of Esau his brother. so he blessed him.

24 Again he said, Art thou my son Esau? and he answered, I am.

25 Then he said, Approach before me, for I will eat the repast of my son; then my soul shall bless thee: so he approached to him, and he ate; he also brought to him wine, and he drank.

26 Moreover Isaac his father, said to him, Approach now, and kiss me, my son.

27 So he approached, and kissed him; and he perceived the odour of his garments, then he blessed him: moreover he said, Behold, the

Jacob, and which had been by a solemn act ratified and conveyed to him: therefore when he said *I am Esau*, he did not mean the person of Esau, but that he was in the place of Esau as to the succession of the primogeniture. This appears from the subsequent conduct of Isaac in the following chapter, when he confirmed this birthright on Jacob; and we learn, what commentators have not told us; viz. that he was informed how Esau had solemnly relinquished his right in favour of Jacob; and that agreeably to the meaning of the word *my Esau*, which was given to him as applicable to the duties of his birthright office, i. e. to prepare, to offer: Jacob had from that time become the ESau, viz. the preparer, or offerer of the sacrifice; the priest of the most high God. This we see must have been the case, otherwise where would have been the justice of Isaac when he knew all the particulars? Had he done wrong in the first instance, or had he thought they had acted wrong, he certainly would not have confirmed that wrong. From which it is obvious that those commentators who have indulged themselves in reprobating the conduct of Rebekah and Jacob, have greatly erred; who have ignorantly supposed that when Jacob said, *I am Esau*, he meant the person and not the office, as is signified by the word; by which vain invectives they have injured the cause of truth. For as Esau was the offerer, so understood by Isaac, so had Jacob now become the offerer, when Esau solemnly passed over the primogeniture to him, agreeably to the meaning of the root of the word.

20. Because the Lord thy God brought it to me. This must appear to be obviously wrong; it is not true according to the original; and it is from such familiar phrases that intelligent men who have had proper views of the majesty of heaven have rejected such parts of scripture. Neither can we suppose that Isaac would have been satisfied with such an answer.

The word *hikrah*, is rendered, he brought, viz. the Lord thy God brought. It is not the third person singular preter in Kal, but in Hiphil, viz. he caused it to be brought.

The other part of this proposition is entirely out of order; viz. *Ephece*, is never rendered, to me. *van Phinee* means the face, the presence, see ver. 30, and with *lamed* prefixed, from, before, or in the presence. Hence, agreeably to the idiom and construction in the verse, it is to be rendered, from the presence. The application is plain; Jacob does not say, the Lord thy God brought it to me, but, Jehovah thy God caused it to be brought before my face. Jacob was now about to succeed to the priesthood, he had put on the dedicated garments of Esau, who had declined accepting the office; and though contrary to his belief

and inclination, he had been employed in some of the inferior departments of the sacrificial worship. It will therefore be seen that Jacob was justifiable in thus speaking, as it was the truth; the history shews by the approval of Isaac when he knew of the defection of Esau, that it was consistent with the design of God, as none holding the opinions of Esau could fill the office of the priesthood.

But a question arises here: How are we to understand the clause, the Lord thy God caused it to be brought to me? Agreeably to the order under that dispensation, the true translation of this clause authorizes us to say, that the information respecting the succession to the priesthood was given to the then officiating priest, and thus communicated to the family of Jacob, at this interval when he was about to confirm the priesthood on Esau. Had this not been so, Jacob could not have said, Jehovah thy God caused it to be brought to me. But another question may be asked: why was this kept from Jacob? The answer is, because Jacob knowing that the firstborn succeeded by divine right to the priesthood, he would have confirmed the priesthood on Esau in preference to Jacob. Another question also presents itself. Why was this partiality then shewn to Jacob in the divine view when it was contrary to the divine institution? I have before assigned a sufficient cause, similar to that which cut off the firstborn of Adam; he had countenanced the false worship of the land, and therefore for this reason it was that God said by the prophet, Yet I loved Jacob, and I hated (rejected) Esau. See on ch. xxv: 30.

27. Smell of a field which the Lord hath blessed. This verse requires great attention, for the true meaning and application according to the Hebrew, is not given in any part of it. There can be neither meaning, application, nor sanctity, in comparing the smell of the garments of Jacob to the smell of a field which the Lord hath blessed. Some have erroneously concluded from the authorised version, that the garments of Esau smelled of the odour of the field, because it is said he was a man of the field; but these conclusions are not to be drawn from the original. It will be allowed by the intelligent reader, that God blesses all that his hand hath made, therefore all fields must be blessed with the dew of heaven alike. Had nothing more been comprehended in this passage, surely the sacred writer would not have committed so unimportant a matter to the pages of the word of God. I shall proceed to shew, agreeably to the Hebrew, that this passage has a different meaning and application.

The first word *vayasarach*, is rendered and he smelled:

odour of my son, is like the odour of a field; for JEHOVAH hath blessed him.

28 Therefore God give to thee, of the dew of the heaven; and the fatness of the earth: with increase of corn, and wine.

29 People will serve thee, yea nations will bow to thee; be mighty before thy brethren; for the sons of thy mother, shall bow to thee: cursed is every one that curseth thee; but blessed is he that blesseth thee.

30 Now it was when Isaac had ceased, to bless Jacob, while Jacob was yet going forth, from the presence of Isaac his father: that Esau his brother, came with his provision.

31 For he also had prepared the repasts; so he came to his father: then he said to his father, Will my father arise and eat of the provision of his son? for this cause, thy soul shall bless me.

32 Then Isaac his father, said to him, Who art thou? and he said, I am thy son, thy firstborn, Esau.

but the true sense here is the same as it is in Isaiah xi. 3, to perceive mentally; it is used when God looked favourably on the devotion of the offerer, and accepted his sacrifice; and according to the idiom of the verb, keeping in mind the intention of Isaac, it should be translated, and he perceived.

רִיחַ *Reeyach*, without any attention to the necessity of varying the word agreeably to the obvious sense of the passage, and the intention of the speaker, is rendered *smell*; but as this word is always used by the sacred writers to mean the incense ascending before the sacrifice, when offered by the high priest in his sacred garments before the altar, to which office Jacob now had succeeded; I have rendered it in connection with the following noun בְּגָדָיו *bagadavay*, the odour of his garments, viz. of holy garments which the officiating priest put on when he caused the incense to ascend, as he ministered before the altar. See Exod. xxviii. 3, 4; where the same word connected with קֹדֶשׁ *kodesh*, i. e. *holy*, is translated *holy garments*.

שָׂדֶה *Sadeh*, is rendered *field*; but it also with equal propriety is used to mean, the *land*, or *country*, and will read, in conformity with the whole verse, thus; as the incense (or first fruits) of the land, which were always brought for acceptance before the altar.

Which the Lord hath blessed. עֲשֵׂה *Esher*, is translated as a pronoun relative, viz. *which*, and is made to refer to שָׂדֶה *sadeh*, *field*; but it has no such application. The true translation of the two last words in this verse will prove this. בֵּרַכְתָּ *Beerako*, is in the common version rendered, *hath blessed*; and the clause reads, as the smell of a field which the Lord hath blessed: but this word with the oblique case of the third person singular, as it is in Hebrew, truly reads, *hath blessed him*. So that the translators have totally rejected the pronoun as it is in the original, on which depends the true understanding of the verse. Such was the nature of a vow to God, that it was to be most religiously observed; therefore the solemnity of passing over the primogeniture, was like an irrevocable decree; and though the sacred historian does not introduce any other persons, it does not appear necessary, because the communication was from God, and did not require the aid of man. Neither

33 Now Isaac trembled; with a very great trembling; and he said, Who! where is he that hath taken provision, which he hath brought to me? for I have eaten of all, before thou camest, and I have blessed him: yea he will be blessed.

34 When Esau heard the words of his father; then he cried with an exceeding great, and very bitter cry; and he said to his father, Bless me, also me, my father.

35 Then he said, Thy brother came, with subtilty; and hath taken thy blessing.

36 And he said, Rightly his name is called Jacob; for he hath supplanted me this second time; he took my birthright, and behold now, he hath taken my blessing: again he said, Hast thou not reserved a blessing for me?

37 Now Isaac answered, and said to Esau, Behold, I have made him mighty before thee, and all his brethren, I have given to him for

are we to suppose that at this period the church did not consist of numbers, which is the view we have in the common version: for by the preaching of Abraham, which was above a hundred years, the worship of God was established in many parts of Canaan.

Upon the whole it appears that this transaction was agreeably to the divine appointment, on the ground that has been mentioned, viz. the defection of Esau, who had adopted the parasitical order of worship without sacrifice. It is highly interesting, as it opens to our view the patriarchal custom of establishing the succeeding representative head of the church, and it makes good sense of the passage. But the authorized version is not only contrary to the grammar of the language, as I have shewn by the true translation of בֵּרַכְתָּ *beerako*, for *Jehovah hath blessed him*; but it also gives us no information respecting this passing over, or confirming of the priesthood to Jacob by the sacrifice, which is sufficiently evident, as he says, *God hath blessed him, viz. accepted the sacrifice*.

28. God give thee of the dew of Heaven. The verb נָתַן *veyithen*, to give, is not a simple expression of good-will, as it is in the common version, but he speaks positively because he speaks by divine information, thus, therefore God will give to thee.

29. Let people serve thee, &c. The words *let*, and *down*, occur twice in the common version, but there is not any authority for them in the Hebrew, and the reader will see that they are unnecessary; the reading is correct, concise, and dignified in the original.

Be Lord over thy brethren. Heb. Be mighty before thy brethren.

30. מִסְעָדוֹ *Miscedo* is rendered, *his hunting*; it properly means *his provision*, Gen. xlii. 25; Exod. xii. 39; Job xxviii. 41.

33. And Isaac trembled. From this circumstance we may rest assured that this repast or sacrificial offering, signified a solemn conveyance of the primogeniture, which was understood by this people to be of such a nature that it could not be revoked; or where was the necessity for the great fear which Isaac manifested? Had it been a transaction of an inferior nature, it would, no doubt, have been of little effect.

37. I have made him thy Lord. Heb. I have made him mighty.

servants; with corn and wine, I have sustained him: and therefore now what shall I do my son?

38 Moreover Esau said to his father, Is there but one blessing with thee my father? bless me, also me, O my father: and Esau raised his voice, and wept.

39 Then Isaac his father answered, and said to him: Behold, the fatness of the earth shall be thy dwelling; and the dew of heaven, from the most high.

40 But by thy sword thou wilt live, yet thou shalt serve thy brother; and it shall be when thou shalt rule; that thou shalt break his yoke from off thy neck.

41 Now Esau hated Jacob, because of the blessing, wherewith his father blessed him: and Esau said from his heart; The days of mourning for my father approach; then I will slay Jacob my brother.

42 When the words of Esau her eldest son, were told to Rebekah: then she sent and called for Jacob, her younger son, and said to him; Behold Esau thy brother, comforteth himself concerning thee, that he shall slay thee.

43 Therefore now my son, hearken to my voice; and arise, flee for thyself, to Laban my brother, of Haran.

44 There thou shalt dwell with him, a short time; till that thou shalt turn away, the wrath of thy brother;

45 Till the anger of thy brother turneth from thee, and he forget that which thou hast done to him; then I will send, and fetch thee from thence: for why must I lose both of you in one day?

46 Rebekah also said to Isaac; I am weary of my life, because of the presence of the daughters of Heth: if Jacob take a woman from the daughters of Heth, like these of the daughters of the land; what is life to me?

With corn and wine. With bread and wine, which were offered at the sacrificial rites before the altar. That is, he had passed over and had confirmed to Jacob the tenth of the increase of the land, which was appropriated to the support of the public worship.

38. *Esau lifted up his voice and wept.* Esau had rejected the sacrifices, and had adopted the Canaanitish worship.

39. *The dew of heaven from above.* We have seen that Esau having disregarded his birthright privileges, which embraced the priesthood as representative of the Messiah, had passed it over to Jacob, in the usual way, by a sacramental repast; see on ch. xxv. 30. It also appears that he had relinquished the true worship of God, and had married among the idolaters

NOW Isaac called for Jacob, and he blessed him: for he had charged him, and said to him; Thou shalt not take a woman, of the daughters of Canaan.

2 Arise, go to Padan-aram; to the house of Bethuel, the father of thy mother: and take to thee from thence, a woman, of the daughters of Laban, the brother of thy mother.

3 For God Almighty will bless thee; moreover he will make thee fruitful, and he will multiply thee: yea thou wilt be for a multitude of people.

4 He will also give to thee the blessing of Abraham, to thee and to thy posterity with thee: for thou wilt inherit the land of thy sojourning; which God gave, to Abraham.

5 Then Isaac sent Jacob, and he went to Padan-aram, to Laban the son of Bethuel the Aramite; the brother of Rebekah, the mother of Jacob, and Esau.

6 When Esau saw, that Isaac had blessed Jacob, and had sent him to Padan-aram, to take for him from thence, a woman: when he blessed him, that he gave a charge to him saying; Thou shalt not take a woman, of the daughters of Canaan;

7 That Jacob hearkened to his father, and to his mother: and went to Padan-aram;

8 When Esau saw, that the daughters of Canaan were evil, in the eyes of Isaac his father;

9 Then Esau went, to Ishmael; and he took Mahalath, the daughter of Ishmael the son of Abraham, the sister of Nabajoth, to the wives he had, for a wife.

10 ¶ So Jacob departed, from Beer-sheba, and went toward Haran.

11 Now he had arrived at a place, and he lodged there, because the sun had departed;

of Canaan; by which conduct he had confirmed his solemn contract. Isaac informed him that he had made Jacob his lord; that is, his lord as to the priesthood: for in temporals we see, that when Jacob came from Aram he was the ruler of Edom. This accords with the blessing of Jacob; Esau was to abound with temporal blessings.

46. *What good shall my life do me?* The words, good, shall, do, me, are supplied; they have no authority in the Hebrew. Heb. *What is life to me?*

4. *Wherein thou art a stranger.* This is the translation of *ṭarṭu migreha*. But the *ṭ* caph, postfixed, must be trans-

then he took some of the stones of that place; which he erected at his beginning: and he rested in the place.

12 Moreover he dreamed, when behold, a path-pillar of earth; and its top reached the

lated by the oblique case singular, *thee*; as the learned Hebraist will see. The words, *wherein thou art*, are not only improper, but redundant. Heb. *of thy sojourning*.

11. *And he lighted upon a certain place.* Heb. *he arrived*.

And put them for his pillows. From the common version, we suppose that Jacob took certain stones, and placed them for his pillows, on which he slept. *וַיִּשְׁכַּח* *Vayaashem* is rendered, *and put*; but this choice of words has obliged the translators to put in two words for which there is no authority in the original, viz. *them for*. It does not appear however, that he put these stones for pillows and slept on them; and if the translators had recollected that he was now in a city, and not in a desert, the passage would have had a rendering more consistent with the intention of the writer. The word *וַיִּשְׁכַּח* *Vayaashem* means to *put* in a variety of passages, but it cannot always be rendered by these express words, though the same radical meaning of the root must be preserved. The same word with the same vowels occurs Exod. xl. 18, 21, 28, *and he set up*.

וַיִּשְׁכַּח *Marashitay*, *PILLOWS*; but it has not this meaning and application: this word cannot with any propriety be translated to mean *pillows*; it signifies the *head*, the *beginning*, the *first*; see Job xlii. 18, *his beginning*; Eccles. vii. 8; 1 Kings, xix. 6, *at his head*. In these places the word is rightly translated, and we shall find that it should be so rendered in other parts of scripture, where the translators have rendered it by *pillows* and *bolsters*, see 1 Sam. xxvi. 11, *the spear which is at his bolster*, (his head.) Ch. xix. 13, *And Michael took an image and laid it in the bed, and she put a crown of goats hair for his bolster* (his head); see also, 2 Kings viii. 15, where *כִּבְר* *Kebir*, which in 1 Sam. xxvi. 11, is rendered *pillow*, is there properly translated by *cloth*.

It appears that the above is the true translation of the word; it was of no consequence for the venerable writer to inform us, 1 Sam. xix. 13, that the bolster was stuffed with *goats hair*: but it was proper to say, that a *cloth*, or *cap* of goats hair, was put on the head of the image to make it resemble a man. I therefore translate this word agreeably to its plain meaning. From which it is evident that the patriarch did not put these stones for pillows to sleep on; but the sacred writer applied this word to the beginning of his ministry. We therefore understand from this passage, that Jacob having succeeded to the priesthood, and having arrived at *בֵּתֶל* *Bethel*, or the *house of God*, which is the meaning, he set up an altar at this place, the place of his beginning to preach or call on the name of God.

The translators did not recollect that at this period, in the east, travellers were accommodated at the tabernacles with food and rest. And we see that Jacob when he returned to his country rested with his whole family at this very place, Bethel. But Jacob, as the representative head of the church, was well known to the officiating priest at this tabernacle at Bethel.

But an objection may be made here; if at Bethel there was a house of God, where was the necessity for Jacob to erect an altar? The reason is obvious, for after the death of Abraham, this place, where he first began to preach in the name of the Lord when he was called from Chaldea, seems to have been totally forgotten during the life of Isaac. And this being also the first place where Jacob began to preach, it was necessary

heaven: then behold, the messengers of God, ascending, and descending before him.

13 Moreover behold, JEHOVAH was present above him, and he said; I am JEHOVAH, God of Abraham thy father; and God of Isaac: the

for him to build an altar to God, to restore the worship, and to call on the people to keep up the worship of him only, agreeably to the rites and ceremonies which had been taught them by Abraham.

12. *A ladder set upon the earth, &c.* This is the only place where *סֻלָּאָם* *sulaam* occurs in scripture, rendered by *ladder*; and it is remarkable that commentators and lexicon writers have not attempted, from the constituent part of its root, to shew that it has a more important reading.

The radix of this word is most intimately connected with *סָלַל* *selul*; which means a *road*, a *highway*, a *path*, a *causeway*. Isa. xi. 16; ch. xix. 23; Numb. xix. 19; 1 Chron. xxvi. 16; Isa. xl. 3. And with *נֶמֶךְ* *nem* postfixed to this noun, *their path*, as it is rendered Isa. lix. 7; Jud. v. 20; in the plural.

מִטָּה *Mutsaab* is rendered *set*; but this word means literally, a *pillar* set up to guide the traveller. See Jud. ix. 6, *by the pillar of the pillar*. Here the same word, both vowels and consonants, is necessarily translated a *pillar*; as the word is also properly rendered in the 20th verse of this chapter, which Jacob consecrated.

On the earth. As an error was made by rendering the word *מִטָּה* *mutsaab*, *set*, instead of *pillar*, the translators were obliged to introduce the word *אֶרֶץ* *artsah*, *earth*, by the words *on the*; for which there is not any authority in the original. This pillar which Jacob saw, was the *sacred pillar*, the *pillar of earth*; which was commanded to be made for the *burnt-offerings*, and the *peace-offerings*, Exod. xx. 24; *an altar of earth thou shalt make before me*: and thus the clause *אֶרֶץ מִטָּה* *sulaam mutsaab artsah*, should be translated, a *path-pillar of earth*. The allusion is striking; for as the *path-pillar*, or *guide-post*, was to guide the traveller, so this *sacred path-pillar* which was shewn to Jacob, by which he saw the messengers of God ascending and descending to him, was a full confirmation to him that the priestly office to which he had been appointed by Isaac, the then governing head of the church, was consistent with divine order, and that he was proceeding in the right way, by sacrificial worship, as typical of the coming of Messiah the Redeemer.

On it. The translators having supposed that the word *סֻלָּאָם* *sulaam* meant a *ladder*, have, in conformity with this view, translated *וַיַּעַל* *bo*, *on it*; viz. *and descending on it*. But as *וַיַּעַל* is the masculine pronoun, and as there is no neuter in the language; but more particularly as it was applied by the sacred writer to signify that the divine communication by the Cherubim in the Holy of Holies, was to descend to him, as the *מַלְאָכִים* *malake*, *messenger*, or representative head of the true church; and as he had also, by virtue of his office, the sole right of entering the Holy of Holies with the blood of the sacrifice for the atonement of the people, once a year to stand for all their transgressions, and to present their supplications before the mercy-seat, which ascended to God, and descended to him: I have preserved the true literal reading of *וַיַּעַל*, viz. *to him*.

13. *And behold the Lord stood above it.* In the common version we are led to conclude that Jacob saw Jehovah: by which word we understand, the *infinite*, *eternal*, *uncreate*, *omnipotent*, *omnipresent*, and *omniscient* God. But as we have

land, which thou liest upon, I will give it to thee, and to thy posterity;

14 And thy posterity shall be as the dust of the earth; yea thou shalt spread west and east, and north and south: for by thee and in thy posterity, all the families of the earth shall be blessed.

15 Now behold, I am with thee, for I will keep thee even whither thou goest; yea I will cause thee to return; to this land; surely I will

no authority in scripture for the support of this manifestation, there must be an error in the common version of this passage. It is said, Exod. xxxiii. 20, *for there shall no man see me and live.* And in Deut. iv. 15, *Take ye therefore good heed to yourselves, for ye saw no manner of similitude on the day that the Lord spake unto you in Horeb.* Therefore it cannot be that God would give a manifestation so contrary to the positive declaration of his express word, which must necessarily have been so had such a manifestation been given: Jacob must not only have seen his face, but his similitude also.

We are therefore naturally led to conclude, agreeably to this view, and in conformity with the circumstance here recorded concerning Jacob, that it had relation to his entrance into the ministry. Jacob had been accepted as the successor to his father in the presence of God; Isaac also, who was informed concerning all the particulars of the defection of Esau, acceded; otherwise he would not have confirmed the succession on him, as observed. Jacob had now arrived at the city of Luz, ver. 19, and was then at the tabernacle which Abraham had erected, where he lodged; these places in those days were appointed for the reception of travellers: for he declares it to be, *the House of God, the gate of heaven*, ver. 17, viz. the tabernacle, at *לֵזַב* Luz, i. e. the almond grove, for that is the meaning of the word; it was the grove where they prepared the sacrifices. Hence from Luz, or the sacrificial grove before the tabernacle, at the inauguration of Jacob, the name bearing a similar application, the place was called Bethel, i. e. *the house of God*, where Isaac, as the patriarch of the church of God, was well known throughout the land.

The word *אָנִי* *nissab*, rendered *he stood*, is in the common version applied to God, viz. *and the Lord stood above it*: that is, according to the translation, above the ladder in the heaven, and conversed with Jacob; but this cannot be allowed for the reasons above assigned. This word means to be established, so as to stand firm, to be confirmed, 1 Chron. xvi. 9; Prov. xv. 25. And if we attend to its obvious application, it means to be established in an office; to be set over. See where the same word is so translated, 1 Sam. xxii. 9, *was set over*; to be settled; Psa. cxix. 89, *thy word is settled*; to be present, Exod. xxxiv. 2, *and present thyself*; 1 Sam. x. 19, *present yourselves*; Job i. 6, *to present themselves*. The verb is in Niphal, not in the conjugation Kal; and therefore cannot be translated *he stood*, but *he was present*; that is, God was present as in the usual way of his communication.

Thus the priesthood was established, confirmed, settled, on Jacob at this place in the tabernacle in the presence of God, and he was informed, that he should receive the communication in this way which God had appointed, from above the Cherubim. Agreeably to what is said, Numb. xiv. 22, *And there I will meet with thee, and I will commune with thee, from above the mercy-seat, from between the Cherubim.*

not forsake thee; even when that I have done, what I have spoken, concerning thee.

16 Then Jacob waked from his sleep; and he said, Surely JEHOVAH is in this place: but I knew it not.

17 And he feared, for he said, How dreadful is this place: is not this because it is the house of God? yea this is the gate of heaven.

18 So Jacob rose in the morning, and he took the stone which he purposed at his beginning,

Finally, that the Hebrews were in the full exercise of their religious privileges during the priesthood of Joseph in Egypt, and that they there had their tabernacles, and *Holies of Holies*, and received the divine communication in the appointed way from above the Cherubim, will appear by a reference to Psa. lxxxvii. 2, *The Lord loveth the gates of Zion more than all the dwellings of Jacob.* Here the word *מִשְׁכָּנֹת* *mishkanoth*, which is rendered *dwellings*, is always used to mean the *Holy of Holies*; for it does not mean simply to dwell, as in a house, but to *tabernacle*, to *assemble* at the opening of the *שְׁוֵת* *mishkan*, *Holy of Holies*, for divine worship: and thus the word ought to be understood in all the scripture. See Psa. xciv. 17, *dwell in silence*; but which should be, *tabernacle in silence*: that is, should almost have worshipped in vain, in the tabernacles; lxxxiv. 2;—*cxix. 5*; Exod. xv. 8, *that I may dwell*, Heb. *for I will tabernacle*; ch. 14. 13, *he tabernacled*; Zech. viii. 8, *they shall tabernacle*; Joel iii. 17, 21, *the Lord tabernacleth in Zion.*

Thus we have the meaning and application of the above scripture, Psa. lxxxvii. 2, *The Lord loveth the gates of Zion more than all the dwellings of Jacob.* This was a reference to the time when they were under the priesthood of Jacob and Joseph in Egypt, viz. *more than all the tabernacles of Jacob*: and to the time when they were established in the temple worship in Zion; when the kingly and priestly offices were under the divine Theocracy as representative of the Messiah, whose reign is to be eternal, a king and a priest—a priest for ever.

15. *For I will not leave thee, until I have done that which I have spoken to thee of.* It appears from this translation, that when the things that were spoken of were accomplished, that God would then forsake Jacob. This however cannot be admitted; it would have disheartened Jacob if he had been told that ultimately he was to be forsaken. This error is made by the translators not attending to the idiom and construction of the passage. The word *עַד* *gad*, is rendered by *until*, viz. *until I have done*; but the words, *עַד* *עַד* *asher im*, which immediately follow, are omitted. The word *עַד* *gad*, requires to be translated as it is in other scriptures by *even*; and *עַד* *עַד* *asher im*, when that, viz. *even when that*. Thus, when the above word has its proper meaning and obvious application, and the others translated which are omitted, we have a consistent sense which undoubtedly was the meaning of the sacred writer.

17. *This is the house of God.* Thus it appears that this place where Jacob rested was not in the open air, as is supposed, but a place of public worship, a *συναγωγή*, or house of prayer, see Luke vi. 12; to such a place it must appear the apostle refers. The words *בֵּית* *Elahim*, are truly rendered in the common version, *the house of God*; and here Jacob received this communication from above the Cherubim, in this tabernacle where he saw the messengers of God, those who officiated before the altar, ascending to the altar and descending, communicating the divine will to the people, as they re-

and erected it for a pillar: and poured oil on the top of it.

19 Also he called the name of the same place, Bethel; but the name of that city *was* Luz, at the beginning.

20 Then Jacob vowed, a vow saying: Surely God will be with me, and keep me in this way that I go; yea he will give to me bread, to eat, and raiment to wear;

21 And I shall return in peace, to the house of my father: therefore JEHOVAH shall be before me for a God:

22 And this stone which I have erected for a

ceived it from God, in the holy place, which makes plain the expression, and behold the Lord stood above it, viz. above the Cherubim. Thus, agreeably to the 13th verse, he was shewn that God communicated with man in his appointed way from above the Cherubim; and he said, *this is the house of God, the gate of heaven*; for this was the only medium of communication between God and man.

20, 21. *If God will be with me.* This is called by objectors "Jacob's selfish bargain." Some commentators have thought that Jacob made this vow for his posterity, viz. "If God shall fulfil these promises, he binds his posterity to build God a house, or temple, and to devote, for the maintenance of his worship, the tenth of all their earthly goods." But this does not get rid of the objection, it leaves it in full force; it is the same, whether he bargains for himself or for his posterity; it remains a selfish bargain. Certainly not any thing of this nature is to be found in the original, therefore the error is chargeable on the translators. In the 13th verse, God informs Jacob that he would be with him, keep him, and bring him to his country again; so that he could not presume to make such conditions.

The whole of this part of the narrative is truly objectionable. Can we for a moment suppose that the venerable patriarch, who had been brought up in the worship of the true God, and who had been instructed by his fathers Isaac and Abraham, was so completely ignorant concerning the nature of the dispensation given to Abraham, and of the nature of the worship which was acceptable to God, as to presume to make so selfish a bargain with the supreme object of his worship? Certainly not. This understanding of the passage which has been the occasion of so much controversy, has arisen from the improper translation of the first word of the second proposition in the 20th verse, and from the first word in the second proposition in the 21st verse. The first runs thus in the original Hebrew, *אם יהוה עממי וישמרני* *im yihyeh Elohim g'mmaadi*, which in the common version is rendered, *If God will be with me.*

It is surprising, after all the translations, comments, and revisions of the scriptures, which have been made for so many hundreds of years, that such a breach of the rules of the language made by the first translators, should have escaped the vigilance of the more modern translators, when the Hebrew language was better understood, than it was in the first ages of the Christian church by Christians. The word *im*, which introduces the second proposition, cannot in any part of scripture, with this construction, be translated by the conjunction *if*; this doubtful state of mind which this word represents the patriarch to be in, is positively contradicted in the 16th verse, where he says, *אני ידעתי כי אתה יהוה* *an i yedeti ki אתה יהוה* *akeen yeesh Jehovah bamaacham, surely*

pillar; shall be a house of God: yea all that thou shalt give to me; a tenth I will give to thee.

CHAP. XXIX.

THEN Jacob pursued his journey; and he went to the land of the sons of the east.

2 Moreover he looked, for behold a well *was* in the field, and lo there were three droves of sheep lying by it, for from that well, they watered their droves; and a great stone *was* upon the mouth of the well.

3 Now thither were all the droves gathered, and they rolled the stone from off the mouth of

the Lord is, in this place. *אם אכן* is an affirmative, admitting of no doubt, and therefore the patriarch could not express himself as he is represented in the translation, by *if the Lord will be with me.*

I shall now proceed to give this reading of *im*, confirmed by other parts of scripture; for with this construction it has the nature of an *adverb*, expressive of strong confidence in every part of the sacred writings; Deut. i. 35, *אם ימ, SURELY there shall not one of these men of this evil generation see that good land, which I swear to give unto your fathers*; 1 Sam. xxv. 34, *For in very deed, as the Lord God of Israel liveth, who hath kept me back from hurting thee, except thou hadst hastened and come to meet me, אם ימ, SURELY there had not been left unto Nabal*; 2 Sam. xv. 21, *As the Lord liveth, and as my lord the king liveth, אם ימ, SURELY, &c.* Isaiah lxii. 8, *The Lord hath sworn by his right hand, and by the arm of his strength, אם ימ, SURELY*; Jer. ii. 14, *The Lord of hosts hath sworn by himself, saying, אם ימ, SURELY.* Thus in the passage under consideration, it represents Jacob as firmly believing what God had revealed to him in the 15th verse, *And behold, I am with thee, and will keep thee every where, whither thou goest, and will bring thee again into this land.* So confident was Jacob that God would perform his promise, that he quoted the very words of the promise with no other difference than what was absolutely necessary, viz. changing the pronoun *I*, when God speaks, for the third person singular of the verb, *he will be*: and the second person singular *אתה g'mmaake, with thee*, for the oblique singular of the pronoun *אני g'mmaadi, with me.*

The same observations will apply to the Septuagint reading of the word *אם*. Abraham, who was a native of Chaldea, spoke the Chaldean Hebrew, and the word *אם* is evidently derived from the Chaldean *an* *behold*, Job xl. 23; Exod. iv. 1; Lev. xxv. 20; Numb. xxiii. 20. And thus the Septuagint have understood it. Neither is there any difference, either in the sense or application of the word, whether we render it by the *interjection* from the Greek, or by the *adverb* from the Hebrew; for whether we say *אם ימ, TRULY, the Lord will be with me*, or *אם BEHOLD, the Lord will be with me*, it amounts to the same, and shews that the Septuagint have preserved the same degree of confidence in Jacob which is signified in the Hebrew.

But the 21st verse, as it stands in all the translations, is equally as objectionable as the 20th verse; for after Jacob has enumerated all the particulars, which in his apparently conditional agreement are a kind of preliminaries to be complied with on the part of God, in order that he might worship him, viz. *if God will be with me, and will keep me in this way that*

the well; so they watered the flock: and they put the stone, upon the mouth of the well, in its place.

4 Then Jacob said to them; My brethren, from whence are ye? and they said; We are from Haran.

5 Then he said to them; Know ye Laban the son of Nahor? and they replied, We know him.

6 Moreover he said to them, Is he prosperous? and they said, Prosperous; also behold Rachel his daughter, cometh, with the sheep.

7 Then he said, Behold, yet the day is high, neither is it time to assemble the cattle: water ye the sheep, and go ye, they must feed.

8 But they said, We cannot, till they shall assemble all the droves; then they roll the stone, from off the mouth of the well, and we water the flock.

9 While he yet spake with them; thus Rachel came with the flock of her father; for she was a shepherdess.

10 Now it was, when Jacob saw Rachel, the daughter of Laban, the brother of his mother, and the flock of Laban brother of his mother: that Jacob drew near, and rolled the stone from

off the mouth of the well; and watered the flock of Laban, the brother of his mother.

11 Moreover Jacob saluted Rachel: then he raised his voice, and wept.

12 For Jacob had told to Rachel, that he was the brother of her father; and therefore the son of Rebekah: so she hastened, and told her father.

13 Now it was when Laban heard the tidings of Jacob the son of his sister, that he hastened to meet him, then he embraced him, and saluted him; and he brought him into his house: when he related to Laban, all these things,

14 Moreover Laban said to him; Surely thou art of my bone and of my flesh: and he dwelt with him, a month of days.

15 Then Laban said to Jacob; What! because thou art my brother, therefore servest thou me thus gratuitously? declare to me something, concerning thy reward.

16 Now Laban had two daughters; the name of the elder, was Leah; and the name of the younger, Rachel.

17 And the eyes of Leah were delicate; but

I go, and will give me bread to eat, and raiment to put on; so that I come again to my father's house in peace, he is made to say in the translation, THEN shall the Lord be my God.

With the form and construction of the *vau*, prefixed to the verb *אָהָב* *ahav*, shall be, it cannot be translated by *then* in any part of scripture. The *vau* in this word has no relation to time, as is signified in the modern translations; the clause is illative, referring to premises advanced, from which a conclusion is made; consequently the *vau*, connected with the verb *אָהָב* *ahav*, shall be, cannot be rendered by any word in the English language so proper as the word *therefore*, viz. *therefore Jehovah shall be before me for a God.*

The *vau* has the same meaning and application in the following passages: Gen. iii. 23, *therefore*; Deut. xxviii. 48; Jer. xiv. 22; Job v. 17.

The words *אֱלֹהִים* *El Elohym*, are rendered *my God*; but notwithstanding the sense is given in the common version, the translation is improper; the *yod*, which signifies *me*, is taken from its connection with *lamed*, and in the common version is rendered as if it were connected with the word *Elohyim*, God: while the *lamed*, prefixed to the word *Elohyim*, i. e. God, is omitted. The 20th, 21st, and 22d verses read in the language of the original, as in the new translation: *Surely God will be with me, and keep me in this way that I go; yea he will give to me bread to eat, and raiment to wear, and I shall return in peace to the house of my father: therefore Jehovah shall be before me, for a God: and this stone which I have erected for a pillar, shall be a house of God.*

NOTES ON CHAP. XXIX.

6. *He is well.* *שָׁלוֹם* *Shalom*, is rendered *he is well*. This word is varied according to idiom; it means, *peace, rest, healthy, prosperous, favour*. It is not likely that townsmen

should know whether he was well or ill; but they might know there was such a man, and that he was rich and prosperous; and therefore I have translated it as it is in other places of scripture.

12. *And Jacob told Rachel.* In the common version it appears that Jacob did not inform Rachel who he was before he saluted her; but in the original, the verb *אָמַר* *vayaged*, rendered *and he told*, is the pluperfect tense, viz. *for he had told*; which shews that he had told Rachel who he was before he saluted her. The *vau*, agreeably to rule, is not a conjunction copulative, but such a one as will assign a reason for something that has been done prior to the thing mentioned, so that the proper word for *vau* is *for*, not *and*.

15. *Shouldst thou therefore serve me for nought?* There is no subjunctive mood; and therefore the word *shouldst* is not proper, because it can be dispensed with. Heb. *Wherefore servest thou me gratuitously?*

17. *Leah was tender eyed.* From this expression it is generally understood that Leah had a defect in her eyes; but the original does not favour such a translation. *אֵינָהּ* *Vegeneen*, rendered *eyes*, has a variety of applications: it also, according to idiom, means the *sight, presence, countenance*; 1 Sam. xvi. 2; *a humble person*, Job xli. 29; and *myr rukoht*, rendered *tender*, means also *delicate, soft, gentle*, Psa. lv. 21; Prov. xv. 1; Ezek. xvii. 22; Job xli. 3. I therefore have translated the verse agreeably to its obvious meaning.

Well-favoured. There is no meaning in this expression: consequently it is not the sense of the original. *נָסָה* *Yophath*, here means *gracefulness in action*. See Ezek. xxviii. 7; Eccl. v. 18, *that which I have seen is COMELY*.

20. *And they seemed to him but a few days.* Some commentators have supposed that these few days could not mean seven years, and that Jacob had Rachel the week after he mar-

Rachel was a beautiful form, and graceful in her appearance.

18 Now Jacob loved Rachel; and he said, I will serve thee seven years, for Rachel thy youngest daughter.

19 And Laban said, I had better give her to thee; than that I give her to another man: abide with me.

20 So Jacob served for Rachel, seven years; and they were in his estimation, as a few days, because of his love for her.

21 Then Jacob said to Laban, Give thou my wife, for my days are fulfilled: and I will go with her.

22 So Laban assembled, all the men of the place, and he prepared a feast.

23 Now it was in the evening, when he took Leah his daughter, and brought her to him; and he abode with her.

24 Moreover Laban gave to her, Zilpah his maid; a maiden for Leah his daughter.

25 Now it was in the morning, when behold, she was Leah: then he said to Laban, Wherefore hast thou done this to me? served I not with thee for Rachel? now why hast thou deceived me?

26 Then Laban said; It is not so done in our country; to give the younger, in the presence of the firstborn;

ried Leah, because it is said *fulfil her week*; but the word *בַּיּוֹמִים* *bayyamim*, days, when connected with *שָׁנָה* *shaanim*, years, means a certain time.

21. *That I may go in unto her.* This passage is erroneously translated; in the original it is more delicately expressed. *וְאָבְרָהָם* *ve abrahah*, is rendered *that I may go*. I have observed, that as the subjunctive mood does not occur in the language, the word *may*, cannot be used; it reads, *and I will go*. There is no preposition *in*; and the word *עִלְיָהּ* *eleyah*, with this construction, reads agreeably to the meaning of *בָּהּ* *al*, with the feminine termination, thus, *with her*. Jacob had now fulfilled his engagement with Laban for Rachel, and he wished to go to his own country; therefore he does not say, as in the common version, *that I may go in unto her*; but, *I will go with her*. This root also means, to *abide*, Numb. xxvii. 19; *abideth*, ver. 23.

25. *What is this that thou hast done to me?* Jacob knew what Laban had done to him; therefore he could not ask the question in the form as it stands in the common version. The clause reads, *why hast thou done this to me?*

27. *Fulfil her week.* *שָׁבַע* *Shubang* is rendered *week* in the old version, and from this many have thought that Jacob had Rachel the week after he married Leah; but the true translation is, *fulfil, or accomplish her seven*, referring to the 20th verse, where it is said, *he served seven years*; there was no necessity for a repetition of the word *years*.

27 Fulfil this seven: and we will give to thee this also, for the service which thou shalt serve with me again, another seven years.

28 Now Jacob did so; thus he fulfilled this seven; and he gave to him, Rachel his daughter, for a wife to him.

29 Also Laban gave to Rachel his daughter; Bilhah his maid; for a maiden to her.

30 Then he came also to Rachel, for he loved Rachel even more than Leah: therefore he served with him, yet another seven years.

31 Now JEHOVAH saw that Leah was neglected; then he opened her womb, but Rachel was barren.

32 So Leah conceived, and bare a son; and she called his name Reuben: for she said, Surely JEHOVAH hath looked on my affliction; therefore now, my husband will love me.

33 Then she conceived again, and bare a son, and she said, Because JEHOVAH hath heard that I was neglected; therefore he hath given to me also this son: and she called his name, Simeon.

34 Also she conceived again, and bare a son; and she said, Now this time, my husband will be joined to me; for I have born to him three sons: therefore was his name called Levi.

35 Moreover she conceived again, and bare a son, and she said, Now I will praise JEHOVAH; therefore she called his name Judah: and she ceased from bearing.

28. *And Jacob did so.* The *and* is rendered by a conjunction copulative no less than three times in this very short verse. The error is obvious: it is first said, *and Jacob did so*, that is, *fulfilled her seventh*; but the verb *וַיַּעַשׂ* *wayyasa*, is very awkwardly rendered by, *and he did*; this word should have been translated as it is 1 Sam. xix. 5; 2 Sam. xxiii. 10; 1 Kings vii. 14, and *he wrought*. For though it is proper in some places to translate it, *and he did*, according to the idiom of the verb, the action should be expressed by different words, retaining the same radical meaning.

31. *The Lord saw that Leah was hated.* It must be plain to the intelligent reader, that this cannot be the true translation; for in the 30th verse it is said, *Jacob loved Rachel more than Leah*. He did not hate her: *וַיִּשְׁנֶה* *sanuah*, here means evidently less affection; he did not pay that attention to her which he did to Rachel. The new translation conveys the true sense of the original.

32, 33, 34, 35. *Reuben*, see ye a son; *Simeon*, he hath hearkened; *Levi*, joined; *Judah*, praise.

NOTES ON CHAP. XXX.

8. *That I may also have children by her.* There is no authority for the following four words, viz. *may have*, and, *by her*. By this rendering the reader is ignorant of the true meaning of this clause, which is important. The word *וּמִמֶּנָּה* *mimenah*, is rendered by *her*; but it cannot have this meaning

CHAP. XXX.

WHEN Rachel saw, that she brought forth to Jacob; then Rachel envied her sister: and she said to Jacob, Give to me children; for if not, I shall die.

2 Then the anger of Jacob was kindled, against Rachel: and he said, Am I instead of God, who hath withheld from thee, the fruit of the womb?

3 Moreover she said, Behold my maid Bilhah, go to her: and she shall bear for my knees, and I even will portion her offspring.

4 So she gave to him Bilhah her maiden, for a wife: and Jacob went to her.

5 Now Bilhah conceived, and she bare to Jacob, a son.

6 Then Rachel said, God hath judged me, and also hath heard my voice; for he hath given to me a son: therefore she called his name, Dan.

7 Moreover she conceived again; thus Bilhah the maiden of Rachel: bare a second son, to Jacob.

its signification is to *number, count*, in order to determine the sum; a denomination of money called a *Manch*, Ezek. xlv. 12, which was equal to one pound one shilling and five pence of our money. And hence it is used to mean, a *measure, part, or portion*, see 1 Sam. i. 5;—ix. 23; 2 Chron. xxxi. 4; Psa. xi. 6;—xvi. 5; 2 Chron. xxxi. 3, *portion*; Exod. xxix. 26; Lev. vii. 33;—viii. 29, *part*.

Thus we shall be enabled to gain the true sense of this passage. We find it was always the custom for a certain portion of the husband's property to be settled upon the woman, which property she could assign to her adopted children, provided she had none of her own. Now Rachel was determined that none of this property should go to the children of her sister: therefore, to satisfy Jacob, she proposed to *portion* them out of her own dowry. The proposition literally reads, *and I therefore will portion her children*.

8. *With great wrestlings I have wrestled with my sister.* This verse in the common version cannot be understood. Objectors say, that she did not wrestle, or strive with her sister, and therefore that it has neither meaning nor application. All this is true; but we shall find that the original Hebrew is plain as to both.

The word *אלהים* *Elohyim*, God, is here translated by *great*. I have before observed that this word cannot be so rendered; in every place of scripture where it occurs, it always means God; it is the proper name of the Divine Majesty.

נפתלי *Naphtali*, and *נפתלי* *niphtali*, are rendered, *wrestlings have I wrestled*; its true radical meaning is, to be *entwined, interwoven, or joined*.

11. *A troop cometh.* There is no word for *cometh*, in the original: and the word *באגאד* *baagad*, means to *overcome*; see ch. xlix. 19, where the word has this meaning.

13. *The daughters will call me blessed.* Every one who had children were esteemed blessed, because agreeably to the

8 Now Rachel said, God hath joined me. I am joined with my sister, therefore I have prevailed: and she called his name, Naphtali.

9 Now Leah saw, that she ceased from bearing: then she took Zilpah her maiden; and gave her to Jacob, for a wife.

10 And Zilpah the maid of Leah, bare Jacob a son.

11 Then Leah said, An overcomer: and she called his name, Gad.

12 And Zilpah the maid of Leah, bare a second son to Jacob.

13 Then Leah said; Happy am I, for the daughters will bless me: and she called his name, Ashur.

14 Now Reuben went in the days of wheat-harvest, for he received the fruits of the field; and he brought them, to Leah his mother: then Rachel said to Leah; Give me I pray thee, for myself; some of the fruits, of thy son.

15 And she said to her, Is it a small matter, thou hast taken my husband; that thou wilt

ancient promise, Messiah was to come in the line of Abraham. The verb, *to call*, is not in the original; it reads more elegantly according to the literal Hebrew, viz. *the daughters will bless me*.

14. *Reuben—found mandrakes.* This passage has been greatly misunderstood by commentators. Many have supposed that the *דודאים* *doudaaim*, were some particular kind of fruit that his mother was fond of; while others have made conclusions as erroneous. Not a few have opened the mouth of infidelity by suggesting an interpretation which has had no other tendency than to lead the mind to a sensual view of this subject. But no such meaning is comprehended in the word. It had been better to have left the word with the Hebrew pronunciation in English, viz. *doudaaim*; then, in the course of 1800 years, no doubt, some one might have hit on the true meaning and application. It certainly is more intelligible than the word *mandrakes*.

Translators and commentators should have recollected that Leah was the legitimate wife of Jacob, and that the law of primogeniture gave to her eldest son the far greater part of the produce of the estates of Jacob; and that the other branches of his family were not entitled to such property only by gift; a certain portion of which was at the disposal of the wife, being hers by right of dowry. For it was the custom anciently to give the wife's dowry to herself, that she might have it in her power to provide for the younger branches of his family, which is the custom observed at this day in all the civilized eastern nations. Therefore Rachel petitions Leah for a part of the production of the land, as is meant by the words *כִּטְסֵי חִטִּים* *kitsir chittim*, *wheat-harvest*. That is, Reuben went at the time of the wheat-harvest to receive that part of the fruits of the land which was his mother's portion, and Rachel bargains with her to relinquish Jacob for a time on this condition. This word *דודאים* *doudaaim* was used as a general term to signify the fruits of the land; in this sense it is introduced, Cant. vii.

also take the fruits of my son? then Rachel replied, Even so, he shall rest with thee this night; for the fruits of thy son.

16 Now Jacob came from the field in the evening; when Leah went forth to meet him, then she said, Thou shalt come to me; for surely I have hired thee, with the fruits of thy son: so he rested with her that night.

17 And God hearkened to Leah; for she conceived and bare to Jacob a fifth son.

18 Then Leah said, God hath given my reward, because I have given my maiden to my husband: and she called his name, Issachar.

19 And Leah conceived again; and bare the sixth son, to Jacob.

20 Then Leah said, God hath endowed me with a good dowry; now my husband will cohabit with me, for I have born to him six sons: so she called his name Zebulon.

21 Also afterward she bare a daughter; and she called her name, Dinah.

22 Moreover God remembered Rachel, for God hearkened to her; and he opened her womb.

23 Then she conceived and bare a son; and she said, God hath taken away my reproach.

24 So she called his name Joseph, saying; JEHOVAH hath added to me another son.

25 Now it was, when Rachel had born Joseph, that Jacob said to Laban; Send me, for I will go, to my place, even to my land.

26 Deliver my wives and my children, for I have served before thee for them, and I will depart: for thou knowest in my servitude, that I served thee.

27 Then Laban said to him; Surely now I have found favour in thine eyes: I have experienced that JEHOVAH hath blessed me, because of thee.

28 Moreover he said: Appoint thy reward from me, and I will give it.

29 Therefore he said to him; Thou knowest

how I have served thee; and that thy cattle were with me;

30 Whereas little of which pertained to thee before me, but it is broken forth into a multitude; yea JEHOVAH hath blessed thee, out of my industry: and now when shall I provide also for my house?

31 Then he said, What shall I give to thee? and Jacob answered, Thou shalt not give to me any thing; if thou wilt do for me this thing, I will return, I will feed, I will keep thy flock.

32 I will pass over all thy flock this day, removing from thence every sheep speckled and streaked, and every brown sheep among the lambs, and streaked and speckled among the goats: such shall be my reward.

33 So shall my uprightness answer for me at a future day, in thy presence when thou shalt come concerning my hire: all which are not speckled and streaked among the goats, and brown among the sheep; take away the same before me.

34 Then Laban said, Behold, it shall be according to thy word.

35 Then on the same day, he removed the he-goats, coloured and streaked, and all the she-goats speckled and streaked; all that had white on him; and all the brown among the lambs: which he delivered into the hand of his sons.

36 And he appointed a journey of three days, between himself and Jacob: so Jacob fed the rest of the flock of Laban.

37 Then Jacob took for himself, a rod of fresh white poplar, and hazel, and of the chestnut-tree: and he pilled from them pillings of white; making bare the white, which was upon the rods.

38 And he put the rods which he had pilled, in channels of running water, where the flocks came to drink, before the flocks, as they grew warm when they came to drink.

13, THE FRUITS give a smell, and at our gates are all manner of pleasant fruits.

18. My hire, agreeably to our idiom, my wages, from שכר *sakar*, to satisfy; therefore she called his name Issachar.

20, 21, 24. Zebulon, a dwelling; Dinah, judged her; Joseph, to add.

25. To mine own place, and to my country. Here is a repetition which does not occur in the original. The *ven* prefixed to *ven artsi*, is explanatory, which reads, even to my land.

26. For thou knowest my service which I have done thee. The sense may be comprehended in the common version, but the mode of expression is awkward, the translation incorrect, and some words are omitted. The word *na' eth*, has been passed over in the last proposition, which should be rendered as it is in Gen. vi. 14; 1 Sam. xvii. 16, by, in. And *gnabodanti*, should not be translated my service, but my servitude; which with *na' eth*, reads, in my service. The last word, *gnabodtika*, is rendered, I have done thee: this is improper; it reads literally, I have served thee.

39 So the flocks grew warm before the rods: and the flocks brought forth; coloured, speckled, and streaked.

40 For Jacob separated the lambs; and he set the faces of the flock toward the coloured, and all the brown in the flock of Laban: then he put for himself droves apart; but he put them not to the flock of Laban.

41 Now it was, when any of the strouger of the flock grew warm; that Jacob laid the rods before the eyes of the flock in the channels, as they grew warm before the rods.

42 But before the feeblers of the flock, he laid not; because the feeblers were for Laban, and the stronger for Jacob.

43 Moreover the man increased most abundantly; for he had before him, a flock of multitudes; also maidens, and servants, and camels, and asses.

CHAP. XXXI.

NOW he had heard the words of the sons of Laban, saying; Jacob hath taken, of all which our father had: even from that of our father, he hath gotten all this abundance.

2 Moreover Jacob saw, the countenance of Laban; but behold it was not toward him, as heretofore.

3 Then **JEHOVAH** said to Jacob, Return to the land of thy fathers, even to thy kindred; and I will be with thee.

4 So Jacob sent, and called for Rachel and for Leah, to the field, to his flock:

5 And he said to them, I have seen the countenance of your father, that it is not toward me as heretofore: but the God of my father, hath been with me.

6 Now ye know, that with all my power, I have served your father;

7 Yet your father hath deceived me, and hath

changed my reward ten times: but God suffered him not, to injure me.

8 If thus he said, The speckled shall be thy reward; then all the flock bare speckled: but if thus he said, The coloured shall be thy reward; then all the flock bare coloured.

9 Thus God hath taken the cattle of your father, which he hath given to me.

10 For it was at the time the flock grew warm; that I raised mine eyes, when I saw in a dream: and behold the rams that mounted upon the flock were coloured, speckled, and grised.

11 Then the messenger of God said to me, in a dream, Jacob: and I said: Here am I.

12 And he said, Raise now thine eyes, and observe, all the rams that mount upon the flock; coloured, speckled, and grised: for I have seen all that Laban, doth to thee.

13 I am the God of Bethel, where thou anointedst the pillar; where thou vowedst before me there a vow: now arise go forth from this land, and return to the land of thy nativity.

14 Then Rachel answered, also Leah; and they said to him: Have we longer a portion, or inheritance, in the house of our father?

15 Are we not esteemed aliens to him? for he hath sold us: yea he had also quite consumed our wealth.

16 Truly all the riches which God hath rescued from our father; are for us and for our children: therefore all that God hath said to thee, do.

17 Then Jacob arose: and set his sons and his women, upon the camels.

18 And he brought all his cattle, and all his substance which he had procured; the cattle he had purchased, which he procured in Padan-aram; to come to Isaac his father, to the land of Canaan.

19 Now Laban had gone to shear his flock;

3. *And the Lord said.* In the appointed way of communication from between the Cherubim.

9. *Thus God hath taken away.* The word *בָּרַק* *yatseel*, rendered in the common version, *hath taken away*, is not a compound word; it reads, *hath taken*: *בָּרַק* *va yithen*, is rendered, *and hath given*; but if the translators had observed that the *va*, prefixed to this word, is a relative, they would have had no necessity to have put into the text the word *them*, for which there is no authority in the original.

11. *And the angel of God spake to me in a dream.* Commentators have thought it strange that this dream is not mentioned before, and have gone for an explanation to the Sama-

ritan in order to remove the difficulty, where the whole dream is pretended to be given. I can see no difficulty in the passage; we are told that God speaks in dreams and visions.

19. *And Rachel had stolen the images that were her father's.* The word *תְּרָפִים* *teraphim*, rendered *images*, has been said to be of doubtful signification; I am of a different opinion. The true meaning of this word is to be had from its root *נָרַן* *raphah*, from whence comes *teraphim*. It means, to remit, to grant, permit, 1 Sam. xi. 3; Deut. ix. 14; Jud. xi. 37. It comprehends the root *רָפָא* *raphaa*, to heal, to make whole, Isa. iv. 10; Job v. 18. From which we learn that they were used a mediums of expiation; that is, as mediums pointing out the

so Rachel took the teraphim, which was before her father.

20 Then Jacob withdrew, without the consent of Laban the Aramite; for he told him not of his removing.

21 Thus he fled with all that he had, when he arose, and passed over the river; and set his face, toward mount Gilead.

22 Now Laban was told, on the third day; that Jacob had fled.

23 Then he took his brethren with him, and pressed after him; a journey of seven days; when he joined him, at mount Gilead.

24 But God came to Laban the Aramite, in a dream that night: and he said to him, Withhold thyself, or thou wilt speak to Jacob, of good for evil.

25 When Laban overtook Jacob; for Jacob had pitched his tent in the mount; where Laban pitched with his brethren, in mount Gilead;

26 Then Laban said to Jacob; What hast thou done? for thou hast withdrawn without my consent: yea thou hast driven my daughters; like captives of the sword.

27 How camest thou so secretly to fly; from me? for thou didst not tell me, or I had sent thee with gladness and with songs, with tabret and with harp.

28 Moreover thou hast not suffered me to kiss even my sons, and my daughters: now thou hast done perversely.

29 It is in the power of my hand, to do evil to you; but the God of your father in time past, spake to me saying, Withhold thyself from speaking with Jacob, of good for evil.

30 But now go, thou hast departed; because thou earnestly longest after the house of thy father: wherefore hast thou concealed my god?

31 Then Jacob answered, and said to Laban: Because I was afraid, for I thought; Perhaps thou wilt take thy daughters from me.

32 With whom thou shalt find thy god, he shall not live; before our brethren, search even thyself what is with me, and take to thyself: but Jacob knew not, that Rachel had taken them.

33 Then Laban came to the tent of Jacob, even to the tent of Leah, and into the tent of

means by rites, ceremonies, and sacrifices, in the due observance of which, in obedience to the divine commands, and by faith in the *Messiah*, the *Shiloh* of the patriarchs, the *Redeemer* of the prophets, and the *Saviour* of men, they were to obtain remission of sin. It must be remembered, that in all the churches to the end of the Israelitish church, figures representative of the divine perfections were appointed to be used in the sanctuary; the most sacred of which was the Cherubim, which had the face of a man, an ox, a lion, and an eagle. Also other representative figures were placed in the temple, taken from the vegetable kingdom, all having their useful meaning, well understood by that people; of which in its place. They appear to have been used therefore by the true worshippers of God, but in process of time, their meaning and application being lost, they were used improperly. Jud. xvii. 13;—xviii. 20; Hosea iii. 4; Zech. x. 2; Ezek. xxi. 20. From this perversion of their primary meaning we have the origin of idolatry; for having lost the signification of these symbolical figures they at length fell into the worship of them. It does not however appear that Laban was an idolater according to the common acceptation of the word; but it shews that those representative figures were too much depended on, even in the family of Jacob.

23. Pursued after him. There is a manifest impropriety in the clause in the common version, וַיִּדְרֹשׁ *va yidroshe*, is rendered and pursued; but here it has the same meaning as in Prov. xix. 7, to urge, to press.

24. Speak not to Jacob either good or bad. This must necessarily appear to every reader as manifestly wrong, for if Laban were not to speak to Jacob either good or bad, it would have put an end to all communication between them. Translators have met with a difficulty here in rendering the words מִטֹּב וּמִרָע *mitob gad raag*, viz. either good or bad; but

the *pa men*, prefixed to *mitob*, good, is genitive, of, or concerning; see Gen. vi. 19; Psa. cix. 18. *va gad*, is here to be rendered, by for, as in Lev. xvi. 18; Ezra x. 4, which then reads; thou shalt not speak to Jacob of good for evil.

25. Then Laban overtook Jacob. But it is also said in the 23rd verse; and they overtook him. There was no necessity for the translators to inform us again that they overtook him. The word *וַיִּדְרֹשׁ* *va yidroshe*, in the 23rd verse, rendered overtook, means to cleave to, to join, see Gen. ii. 24; 2 Chron. iii. 12. Beside, it is the third person singular preter, not the third person plural, as in the common version, viz. he joined, that is, Laban joined.

The word *וַיִּדְרֹשׁ* *va yidroshe*, rendered by overtook, has *va* prefixed, which does not apply to the action but to the time of the verb; and should be translated by when; as with the same construction it is so rendered in other scriptures.

30 to 32. With whomsoever thou shalt find thy gods. The word *אֱלֹהִים* *Elohe*, rendered gods in both these verses, is always a noun singular throughout the scripture; wherever it has been translated as a noun plural, the translators have committed a great error. See Psa. xx. 1, God of Jacob; xliii. 2, God of strength; Isa. xxi. 17, God of Israel;—xxiv. 15, Jer. xxxii. 27; Gen. xxiv. 3, God of heaven, and God of the earth; ch. xxvi. 24, God of Abraham. See on ch. i. 1.

But it appears that this noun singular *Elohe*, is joined with a pronoun plural, *them*, and so many have supposed on that account that it is a noun plural. The form of the teraphim was one, and there were many of them among the people; but we find that the error of those who have supposed the word to be plural, has arisen from considering it as being applied to the number, instead of the form of the teraphim. We cannot have this better illustrated than by referring to Exod. xxxii. 4, And fashioned it with a graving tool after he

both the maidens, but he found nothing: so he went forth from the tent of Leah, and came to the tent of Rachel.

34 Now Rachel had taken the teraphim, and she had put them into the camel panner, where she sat upon them; and Laban searched all the tent, but he found nothing.

35 Then she said to her father, Let there not be anger in the eyes of my lord; for I cannot rise in thy presence, because the custom of women is on me: thus he searched but he found not the teraphim.

36 Now Jacob was angry, and contended with

had made it a molten calf. Here לִבְנֵי גִזְעֵי, *calf*, is a noun singular, connected with אֱלֹהִים *Elohim*, i. e. *thy god*, which shews that this word should be translated a noun singular, viz. *with whomsoever thou shalt find thy god*; and which, as above, referred to the form of the teraphim only. But the pronoun plural אֵלֶּה *Eleth*, *these*, was applied to the number cast in the same mould, as it must appear that one would not be sufficient for all the congregations of Israel, see on Exod. xxxii. 4.

35. *But found not the images.* The word תְּרָפִים *teraphim*, is here translated *images*: but in other parts of scripture the pronunciation of the original word is retained. The meaning and application of this word has been much enquired after in all ages of the Christian Era; but translators and commentators have not given us any satisfactory application. The true application of this word by these ancient people can only be had by attending to the meaning of its root, connected with the circumstances and things to which it must necessarily have been applied in the ancient part of scripture; and which circumstances or things must also have been in perfect conformity as to the effect, with the meaning of the word.

The sacred record informs us, that from the beginning, when man had disobeyed the commands of God, a mediator was promised, to restore him to the favour of the Divine Majesty. Sacrifices, rites, and ceremonies were instituted as representative of him, and symbolical figures bearing some resemblance in their natures to the high qualities and endowments of this great personage, were given to point out his perfections and the nature of his mission. The most sacred of these figures were the Cherubim, and this belief was handed down by the patriarchal churches to the time of Moses.

The teraphim was similar to the Cherubim, originally kept in the houses of pious people, as the Cherubim was in the temple; they were first had as objects to remind them of the coming of the Messiah, who was to be the mediator; and therefore at length we find that they conceived a religious veneration for these representative figures alone, without looking with the eye of faith to Him who was to accomplish this great redemption.

In conformity with this view, the word *teraphim* in its root means to *remit*, or *mediate*, to *abate*, *repair*, *heal*, *restore*; thus to *remit* sin, *abate* punishment, *repair* our loss, *heal* our backslidings, and *restore* us to endless happiness. That the teraphim was originally a sacred symbol, appears plain from the prophet Hosea; who speaking of the desolation of Israel during the long period before Messiah was to make his appearance, says, ch. iii. 4, *For the children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, prince, sacrifice, image, ephod, and tera-*

phim: for Jacob answered and said to Laban; What is my transgression? what is my offence, that thou hast pursued after me?

37 For thou hast searched the whole of my vessels, what hast thou found among any of the vessels of thy house? set it here before my brethren, and thy brethren; and they shall determine between both of us.

38 This twenty years I have been with thee; thy sheep and thy goats have not cast their young: moreover the rams of thy flock I have not eaten.

39 The torn I brought not to thee; I bare

phim. Thus we find that the word is joined with the sacred garments, and with the sacrifice of which they were to be deprived; therefore it must have had an application consistently with its meaning, and may be truly rendered in conformity with its root, by, *RESTOREE, HEALER, MEDIATOR.*

The teraphim was also prostituted to divination, Ezek. xxi. 21, *he consulted with images* (teraphim); 2 Kings xxi. 24, *the familiar spirits—and the images*, (teraphim); Zech. x. 2, *The idols* (teraphim) *have spoken vanity.*

Thus it appears that the teraphim was the representative household image of Laban; and that when Jacob and his family left him, Rachel, who was a worshipper of the true God agreeably to the dispensation given to Abraham, wished to restore the true order of worship, by shewing Laban the extreme folly of trusting in his household image. This was the religious profession of Laban, which had become so external that the dependence was on this as a mediator.

Hence we are authorized to conclude, agreeably with the prophet, that the teraphim was originally a sacred symbol, of which the children of Israel were to be deprived, with all the glorious appendages of the order for the divine communication. Consequently it can have had no other meaning originally than that which the prophet has given by classing it with the most sacred things in the temple worship; and which is consistent with its radical meaning. For as it was the office of the priest, the representative of the eternal high-priest, Messiah, to act as mediator by making an atonement for the people annually on the great day of expiation; so during this long interval they were to be without the representative mediator, the *Shechinah*, and those symbols of the divine communion, which all the churches to the time of Moses, and from him to the captivity in Babylon, were so highly favoured with. This was literally accomplished as declared by the prophet, for at the return from the captivity none of those things were restored. Ezekiel also confirms this, ch. ix. 18, 19, *The glory of the Lord departed from off the threshold of the house—and mounted up from the earth*, and the divine communication by the Cherubim ceased.

38. *This twenty years.* It has been said by commentators, that Jacob was only twenty years absent from his own country. The general opinion is, that he was forty years absent; see Kennicott and others: but the truth is that he was sixty-four years in Aram before he returned to his own country. Some writers have said that Jacob was seventy-seven years old when he went to Aram; others, seeing the absurdity of his going to take a wife at the advanced age of seventy-seven, have reduced his age when he went to fifty-six. We must however be

the loss; at my hand thou hast required it: have I secreted by day, or have I secreted by night?

40 I have continued when the day consumed me, drought and cold by night: yea sleep I have driven from mine eyes.

41 Thus myself, twenty years in thy house; I served thee fourteen years, for thy two daughters; and six years for thy flock: now thou hast changed my reward, ten times.

42 Had not the God of my father, God of Abraham, even the dread of Isaac been with me; surely now empty thou badst sent me: but my affliction and the labour of my hand, God hath seen, and rebuked formerly.

guided by the authority of scripture. For when the disagreement took place between Esau and Jacob, they were forty years old, ch. xxvi. 34. And it was at this period when Isaac sent him to Aram, for we cannot suppose, as he was sent out of the way until the anger of his brother was turned away, ch. xxvii. 45, that he would remain, according to some, thirty-seven years, and according to others, sixteen years, before he fled from the face of his brother, ver. 43. See on ch. xxv. 22, where this is explained.

44. *Let us make a covenant.* A covenant by sacrifice, which under that dispensation was made according to the customary forms by sacrifice, for the due performance of any solemn contract; and which the offerer engaged should be as faithfully done, as he believed in the application of the sacrifice to the Messiah. Now while the children of Laban were under his eye, he had no fear on account of their welfare; but when they were about to depart to a foreign land, it became necessary to impose on Jacob those restraints which might induce him to conduct himself with propriety to his children. Therefore he followed him to obtain this security, which was then, all that an affectionate father could do for his children. Laban then says, *Now therefore depart*, that was, to his own land; for *לָבָן לֵהֵלֵךְ*, properly means, to depart, to go, 1 Kings xii. 5; —xxviii. 21; Neh. viii. 10; Isa. xxx. 21; Gen. xxvii. 16; Exod. xxxiii. 1: He did not follow him to bring them back, but to make, or cut, this covenant with him by sacrifice before the altar, at the tabernacle in mount Gilead; tabernacles being only built on such places at this period. Now though the tabernacle be not mentioned, yet the sacrifice is, and the sacrifices were commanded to be offered on the altar, before the Holy of Holies. The stone which Jacob set up for a pillar, ver. 45, was not the sacrificial altar; it was a stone of remembrance, a recorded testimony kept at this sanctuary, which appears to have been out of the jurisdiction of Padan Aram, and under the patriarchal government of Isaac; a stone of the contract of Laban with him for the due performance of his engagements, and which then could have been enforced by law. It was the pillar of the oath; for when Laban had given Jacob a summary of what he wished him to confirm, it is then said, ver. 53, *And Jacob swore by the fear of his father Isaac.* But when sacrifices were offered oaths were not taken at the altar of God; sacrifices appertained not to the laws of the land, or the transactions between men; they were offerings before God, and only had relation to those things which were to be

43 Then Laban answered and said to Jacob, The daughters are my daughters, and the children my children, even the flock my flock; yea all that thou seest, before me is mine: now concerning my daughters, what shall I do for these this day? or for the children, whom they have borne?

44 Therefore now depart, we will make a covenant, I and thou, which shall be for a witness, between me and thee.

45 Then Jacob took stone, and he erected a pillar.

46 For Jacob had said to his brethren, Gather ye stones; so they took stones, and made a pile: moreover they ate there upon the pile.

taken cognizance of by the Judge of souls. But this was a legal contract, which Jacob was obliged to comply with, a record of the conditions which the laws imposed on any man who took a wife. After this agreement at the pillar, where Jacob swore to fulfil his contract concerning the children of Laban, it is said in the following verse, that Jacob offered sacrifices on the mount, not on the pillar.

The word *נִמַּן* *ve haqyah*, is rendered *and let it be*; there however is not any authority in the original for the words *let it*. The *vau* prefixed, is rendered by *and*; but as it refers to the covenant, it is relative, and should be translated by *which*.

45. *Set up a pillar.* *מַצֵּבָה* *Matsebah*, is rendered a pillar. This word is applied to mean an altar, Deut. xvi. 22, *Neither shalt thou set up any image (or altar) which the Lord thy God hateth*; Hos. iii. 4, *The children of Israel shall be many days—without an image (or altar)*.

Commentators have given us no information respecting the particulars which are comprehended in this passage; we have to this day understood, that Jacob, the women, children, and servants, with Laban and his brethren, during all their stay here, were in the open air, in tents only, on the top of a rugged mountain. Had this been the case, it is reasonable to say, that the agreement might have been no sooner made than it might have been broken. Such agreements as these, where sacrifices were offered on the occasion, were not only binding before God, but were also confirmed by the law of the land.

We learn from scripture, that it was the custom of these ancients to build their places of worship on the tops of mountains; and as it is said in this passage, after Jacob had erected this altar, that he offered sacrifice upon the mount, there can be no doubt but that this was all done in one of the places of public worship, which was on the top of a mountain in the land of Gilead. It will also be remembered, that in these ages there were no inns for travellers, as I have observed; they were always supplied with every thing necessary, both lodging and food, at these places of worship, see ch. xviii. 5.

But it may be said, if this were a place for public worship, there, no doubt, would have been an altar, and therefore it was not necessary for Jacob to have put these stones together. It is not said that he offered sacrifice on this pillar; but that, he offered sacrifice upon the mount, viz. in the usual place, upon the altar in the house of God on this mount. From all the recorded circumstances in the narrative, it does appear plain, that this pillar of agreement was erected in the place adjoining this

47 Now Laban called it, Jegar-sahadutha: but Jacob called it Galeed.

48 Moreover Laban said; This pile witnesseth between me and thee, this day: therefore he called the name thereof, Galeed.

49 Even the watch-tower, for he said; JEHOVAH will watch between me and thee: though we withdraw each from his companion.

50 If thou shalt afflict my daughters, or if thou shalt take women besides my daughters;

house of God, the place appointed for such monuments of agreement, which were not liable to be destroyed, and which then became a legal act, binding the parties to the due observance of their engagements. So that the names given by Laban and Jacob were engraven thereon, under the inspection of the officiating priest in this house of God. From which circumstance we learn, that in those patriarchal ages their agreements were written on monuments of stone, as the most likely to withstand the ravages of time. See Deut. iv. 13.

47. And Laban called it *Jegar-sahadutha*. *Jegar*, means to fear, reverence; and *sahadutha*, is a compound word, from *sahad*, to witness, and *dutha*, to appoint. So that Laban called this altar as a witness of their agreement: he shall fear the appointed witness.

But Jacob called it *Galeed*. *Galeed*, is also a compound word from *gal*, to remove; see 2 Kings, xv.—xviii.—xxv. applied to the Hebrews when they were removed into the countries of their oppressors; and *eed*, means to witness, Gen. xxxi. 44.—xlvi. 50, literally, but Jacob called it, the witness of removal. Thus the different names given to these pillars, signify the consent of both parties, and make a complete sentence. Laban says, he shall fear the appointed witness; Jacob replies, the witness of removal.

Writers have been of various opinions respecting the inscription on these pillars. A modern commentator thinks, that Laban called his "the round heap of witness; and that Jacob by the word Galeed, meant the same thing." This does not appear from the meaning of the words. It was of no consequence whether the pillars were round or square: it is certain that both the appellations comprehend the tenor of their agreement, but which nevertheless are very different. The body of witnesses were the brethren, ver. 46, and the pillars the formal or written evidence subscribed by both parties, explaining generally the terms on which Laban parted with his children; and which are particularly noticed in the 50th verse.

48, 49. *Galeed*—and *Mispah*. But *Mispah*, like *Galeed*, gives us no information why it was so called. In the common version it appears strange and unintelligible why the pillar should have a third name given to it. The two verses are not divided in the common version, though they are in the original; hence it is called both *Galeed* and *Mispah*.

The *vav* prefixed to *Mispah*, is rendered by the conjunction copulative *and*; but as it is explanatory, it should have been rendered by *even*, as it is in other parts of scripture with this construction.

The word *Mispah* is not translated; the Hebrew pronunciation is retained in all the translations. It means a watch-tower, 2 Chron. xx. 24; Isa. xli. 8. I have therefore translated the word agreeably to its meaning, which makes the passage intelligible.

52. *This heap be witness, and this pillar be witness.* An

no man is with us: observe, God is witness, between me and thee.

51 Thus Laban said, to Jacob: Behold this pile, and behold this pillar; which I have set up, between me and thee.

52 This pile witnesseth; also this pillar witnesseth: surely I will not pass this pile to thee; so truly thou shalt not pass over this pile, even this pillar to me, for evil;

53 They shall judge between us, O God of

unnecessary repetition has been said by some captious writers to occur here: this is not so. It was an ancient custom for parties, on the ratification of an agreement, to cast stones together on a heap, and from the same heap, or pile, they each erected a pillar, and inscribed on each pillar reciprocally the terms of their agreement. So that the words, *this heap*, refer to the stones when in this heap, or pile; and *this pillar*, when the same stones were built into each respective pillar. Hence it appears that those commentators who have said that this pillar was set up by Jacob, and have referred to the 45th verse for proof that it was so, have erred in supposing that there was only one pillar erected. Whereas, after they had eaten on the heap or pile, ver. 46, it is said by Laban in the 51st verse, *Behold this pillar which I have cast*.

53. *The God of Abraham and the God of Nahor.* From this passage commentators in general have concluded, that Abraham was an idolater. But in addition to what has been advanced on the 19th verse, the reader will recollect that Jacob was a worshipper of the true God, and as he resided twenty years in the family of Laban, it cannot be supposed that he would have countenanced any thing of this nature. For as he was sent from his own country with a view to avoid any connection with the daughters of Canaan, who were idolaters; and as Isaac commanded him to take him a wife of the daughters of Laban; it cannot be that Isaac would command him to take the daughter of Laban, had he been, as commentators have supposed, an idolater. He might as well have taken one of the Canaanitish women, as one of the daughters of Aram to wife, had the latter been an idolater.

The generally received opinion respecting the profession of Abraham is, that he was an idolater when he was called from Ur of the Chaldees. Such an opinion however is not countenanced in the original Hebrew, nor can the religion of the Bible receive any additional force by classing the great founder of the religion of the Hebrews with the worshippers of idols. The reader will observe in what has been said, that the true worship of God descended in the line of the first patriarchs to Noah, and from him to Abraham. That during this period the doctrine and faith of this ancient church were promulgated in different nations to the time of Abraham, as it was from Melchizedek king of Salem, who was a priest under that dispensation; and finally to the time of Moses, when Jethro priest of Midian performed the service at the sacrifice, in the presence of Moses and Aaron. Therefore it cannot be supposed that Abraham was ignorant as to the worship of the true God, even at the time he met Melchizedek, as is stated in the 14th chapter, which was many years before he was directed to take Isaac to the mountain, ch. xxii.

They shall judge between us. Commentators have supposed from this clause, that Nahor and Abraham were idolaters; because in the common version the verb *gishpatu*,

Abraham and God of Nahor; God of their father: then Jacob swore; in the fear of his father Isaac.

54 Now Jacob offered a sacrifice on the mount; and he called for his brethren to eat bread: so they ate bread, and lodged in the mountain.

55 Then Laban arose in the morning, and he kissed his sons, and his daughters, yea he blessed them; so Laban went and returned to his place.

CHAP. XXXII.

NOW Jacob went on his journey, and the messengers of God met him.

has been understood by them to refer to the God of Nahor, as well as to the God of Abraham, viz. *The God of Abraham, and the God of Nahor, the God of their father, judge between us.* Now commentators have said, that as the word *yishphitou*, is the third person plural future of the verb *to judge*, viz. *they shall judge*; it must show that there are more gods than the God of Abraham mentioned by the sacred writer, and consequently, that as Laban refers to the God of Nahor, in contradistinction to the God of Abraham, both Nahor and Abraham must have been idolaters. This word however is not applied to the God of Abraham, the God of Nahor, or the God of their father Terah, therefore such an application cannot be admitted. Were this reading correct, it would follow, that there was a time when God had no church on earth; for if Abraham had been an idolater, he being the descendant in the promised line, this must necessarily have been the case. But we have found, that in the ark God preserved his church, which came down through the patriarchal churches to Abraham.

Again, had this been as commentators have supposed, we may ask, how it was possible for the God of Abraham and the God of Nahor to have judged between them? The judgment of the God of Abraham, we know, could have been obtained in the usual way of the divine communication from above the Cherubim; but had Nahor been an idolater, how was the judgment of this idolatrous god, a god of wood or stone, to have been obtained? Therefore if we put this construction on the passage, (and with this view it will certainly bear no other,) it must necessarily follow, that judgments so heterogeneous as must have been given, could not have determined respecting the fulfilment of the conditions of this agreement between Laban and Jacob. I therefore proceed to shew that the translation is incorrect, and that in consequence of such translation, all such writers have erred in applying the verb *yishphitou*, to mean the God of Abraham, and the God of Nahor.

In the common version the translators have erred by supplying the article *the*, viz. *the God of Abraham*; in the Hebrew there is no authority for it, and it subverts the meaning of the sacred writer. The verse begins thus: *God of Abraham, and God of Nahor.* Here is a strong appeal made by Laban to God while the sacrifice was on the altar, who he informs Jacob was the God of his grandfather, Nahor, the brother of Abraham, as well as he was the God of his grandfather Abraham. Now after saying in the preceding verse, *this heap be witness*, he then makes an appeal to God, the God of Abraham and

2 Then Jacob said, as soon as he saw them; This is the host of God: and he called the name of the place, Mahanaim.

3 For Jacob had sent messengers before him, to Esau his brother, of the land of Seir, the country of Edom.

4 Also he commanded them saying; Thus ye shall speak, to my lord, even Esau: Thus saith thy servant Jacob; I have sojourned with Laban, and stayed till now.

5 Moreover I have oxen and asses, flocks and men-servants and maidens: and I have sent to certify to my lord; to find favour in thy sight.

6 And the messengers returned, to Jacob

Nahor, and he refers to the two *PILLARS*, the one raised by Jacob, ver. 45, the other by himself, ver. 51, which were to be a witness for each party; and he says, *God of Abraham, and God of Nahor, they (i.e. the witnessing pillars) shall judge between us*; *God of their father*, viz. the inscriptions on the two pillars were to determine the judgment respecting the conditions of the agreement.

Thus we find that the God of Abraham was the God of Nahor. By a reference to the 11th chapter it will be seen that the true worship of God descended in regular succession from Shem to Abraham in the tenth generation. Thus commentators, guided by the Septuagint and the Vulgate translations, which first gave this notice to the world at a time when the Hebrew language was not known among Christians, without a critical examination of the original, have concluded that they were idolaters.

And Jacob swore by the fear of his father Isaac. Commentators have in general passed over this clause, not knowing how to understand these words, *the fear of Isaac*. The word *phachad*, means a religious fear, properly when the mind is impressed with the majesty and holiness of God. This is the proper word, for the humble worshipper of God stands in awe before, but he does not fear or dread him, when he lives agreeably to his commands; see *Ps. cxix. 161, stand in awe*. This is evidently a reference to the circumstance which occurred when Abraham took Isaac to the mountain in the land of Moriah, ch. xxii. The *beth* prefixed to *phachad*, is rendered by, viz. *by the fear*; but its true rendering here is by the preposition *in*; Jacob did not swear by the fear, but *in the fear of his father Isaac*.

NOTES ON CHAP. XXXII.

1. And the angels of God met him. Many pages have been written to prove that the word *malake*, rendered here *angels*, means immortal beings; and thus commentators have been driven to the necessity of supposing that they assumed material bodies in order to render themselves visible to mortals. I must translate the word agreeably to its literal meaning, which is *messengers*.

3. And Jacob sent messengers. Thus we find that the same word is used here for *messengers*, which in the first verse is rendered *angels*. They were the servants of Jacob: therefore it must follow that though Jacob in the 2d verse calls the *malake*, *God's host*, they could not be immortal beings. Neither does it appear from his subsequent conduct; had this been the

saying: We came to thy brother to Esau; and he also cometh to meet thee, and four hundred men with him.

7 Then Jacob feared exceedingly, and he distressed himself: so he divided the people who were with him, also the flock, and the herds, and the camels, into two companies.

8 And he said, If Esau come to one company, and smite him: then it shall be, the company that is left, shall escape.

9 Now Jacob said; God of my father Abraham; and God of my father Isaac: JEHOVAH who said to me, Return to thy land, even to thy kindred, for I will do good to thee;

10 I was little before all the mercies and before all the truth; which thou hast shewed, to thy servant: with my staff I passed over this Jordan; and now I am become two companies.

11 Deliver me I pray thee, from the hand of my brother, from the hand of Esau: for I fear him, or he will come and smite me; the mother with the children.

12 For thou hast said; I will do good to thee: yea I will make thy posterity, as the sand of the sea, for he shall not be numbered because of multitude.

13 So he lodged there, the same night: and he took from what came to his hand, a present for Esau his brother;

14 Two hundred she-goats; and twenty he-goats: two hundred ewes, and twenty rams.

case, it would necessarily have banished all fear from Jacob. What had Jacob to fear if a host of immortal beings had been sent down from heaven to protect him? I shall, as the word occurs where it has been understood as meaning an immortal spirit, shew that it was not so applied by the sacred penman in any part of scripture.

But we find in this verse, that the pluperfect or remote preter tense occurs in the verb *yishlach*, which then reads, not as in the old version, and Jacob sent, but, now Jacob had sent messengers; viz. prior to the time when he met the host; for this is then consistent with the history. Even in the translation Jacob does not express any surprise at such an uncommon appearance; which is reasonable to conclude he would have done, had it been a host of angels, as we have been led to suppose through the erroneous translation of this word. There is not a shadow of authority in the original for supposing that the sacred historian understood this host to have consisted of celestial beings; not a word is said by him to countenance this view, but quite the contrary. For instead of enlarging on so uncommon a circumstance, which the subject in dispute between the two brothers, on no rational scriptural ground whatever called for, we find that the next verse begins by saying, that Jacob sent messengers, not angels, to Esau.

It is also worthy of notice, that when Jacob met this host,

15 Thirty milch camels, with their young: forty cows, and ten steers; twenty asses; and ten foles.

16 Which he delivered into the hand of his servants; drove by drove alone: and he said to his servants, Pass ye over in my presence; and leave a space, between drove and drove.

17 Then he commanded the foremost saying: When Esau my brother meeteth thee, and asketh thee saying; Whose art thou? or whither goest thou? or whose are these before thee?

18 Then thou shalt say, From thy servant even Jacob; the same is a present sent, for my lord Esau: and behold also he is behind us.

19 And he commanded thus the second, also the third; even all that went after the droves, saying; In this manner you shall speak to Esau, when ye deliver them to him.

20 Also say ye, Moreover, thy servant Jacob is behind us; for he said, I will reconcile him with the present, that goeth before me, and afterward I will see his face; perhaps he will lift up my face.

21 So the present passed over, before his face: and he remained that night with the company.

22 Then he arose in the night, and he took his two wives, also his two maidens, with his eleven children: and he passed over the ford Jabbok.

23 When he had taken them, and passed

had he not prior to this meeting sent the messengers to Esau, he would have expressed great surprise, which he does not, either in the old version or in the original. This shews that he expected such messengers from Esau, as he had sent to inform him of his coming. Therefore we see the propriety of the pluperfect tense of the verb *yishlach*, he had sent, but which is omitted in the translation.

10 I am not worthy of the least, &c. The translation of this clause is very incorrect; there is not any authority for the words *am not worthy of*, in the original. The word *anotni*, which is thus rendered, is truly translated thus, I was little; as the latter part of the verse explains it, when with my staff I passed over this Jordan.

12. Which shall not be numbered. The word *yisapheer*, is in the common version applied to the sand of the sea, which cannot be numbered; but the translators had no authority for applying it to the sand of the sea, neither was there any necessity for us to be informed that the sand of the sea could not be numbered. This word is the third person singular future of the verb, and is applied by the sacred writer to *anotni*, posterity; the posterity of Jacob, viz. for he shall not be numbered; see 2 Chron. ii. 2, 17, And he told out—and he numbered.

23. And he took them and sent them over the brook. In the

them over the river: then he passed over with that which he had.

24 Now Jacob remained only, when a man contended with him, till the ascending of the dawn.

22nd verse it is said that Jacob passed over the river; and again in this, that he took them and passed over the brook, and sent over that he had. But it does not appear that he passed over the river twice, consequently there was no necessity for us to be told twice, by an immediate repetition, that he passed over the river. This depends on the translation of *וַיַּעֲבֹד* *yikachem*, which in the common version is translated, and he took; but the verb is the pluperfect, or remote preter, with the *ו* prefixed, which conjunction has here a reference to time, and should be rendered thus, when he had taken. This removes the objection by shewing that there is no improper repetition.

Ver. 24, 25. There is no part of scripture more vulnerable to the attacks of objectors, than the narrative concerning Jacob's wrestling with an angel. From the early ages of the Christian church, to the present day, commentators have been content to take the translation as it stood in the early versions. But as it is not possible to understand it as literally as it is in all the European translations, many intelligent and learned men have rejected the translation of this part, without however attempting to give a better. Abiding by the literal meaning of the original, I am constrained to reject the generally received opinion; nothing of this nature is recorded in the original: the error has been made by the first translators, who made the translation called the Septuagint, after the dispersion of the Jews, the first, or real Septuagint, having been destroyed when the Alexandrian library was burnt.

Objectors have said, "Admitting this Hebrew lawgiver to have been a good man, is it possible to suppose that it was his intention to communicate such a circumstance, so obviously vicious on the part of the person who was, according to popular opinion, an angel? Can we admit that an angel had not power, or was not strong enough, to overcome Jacob? And if he had, what good could have arisen from such a contest? But is it credible, that when the angel saw, as is stated in the translation, that he could not prevail against him by fair means, in order to throw him down, that he put his thigh out of joint? Were we to see two men striving, and that one of them, finding he could not prevail against the other, took an opportunity to maim him, what should we think of such a man? Undoubtedly we should conclude that he merited the most severe punishment; surely then this could not be the conduct of an angel, sent, as is understood, from God."

Such questions as these have often been proposed by objectors for ages, and it is much to be lamented that such a misapplication of the original should have been made by translators. However by attending to the true meaning of the words as applied by the sacred writer, also to the customs of that ancient people, and the phraseology of the language, we shall find that no objection can be brought against this part of scripture in future.

When Jacob on his return to his own country was drawing near to the possessions of Esau, he began to fear that the old quarrel might be renewed. He therefore sent a messenger to inform him that he was on his way. And Esau on his part was anxious to convince him that he had a right to the great personal property of his father, he therefore deputed the

25 When he saw that he prevailed not against him; then he touched the hollow of his loin: thus he clapped the hand on the loin of Jacob, after he contended with him.

26 Moreover he said, Send me, for the dawn

judge of the land to meet Jacob; for it is said, a man, not an angel, wrestled with him. It has been, I say, understood that this wrestling was a contention as to bodily strength; but the word *וַיִּקַּח* *yikach*, rendered *wrestled*, means to contend in argument. That this man contended with Jacob in argument is sufficiently clear; the result was in favour of Jacob, as it is said concerning the man, and when he saw that he prevailed not against him: which is enough to convince us that he was not an angel; but the passage expressly declares, he was a man, viz. and there contended with Ish, a man with him; a man in power among the Idumeans, over whom Esau then reigned; the principal messenger mentioned in the 2nd verse, deputed on the part of Esau to convince Jacob that he had a right, as the eldest son, to the hereditary possessions of his father. Now when Jacob had convinced this messenger that he was not come to dispute with Esau concerning his father's property, and that the birthright which he claimed as given by a solemn act of his father to him, had no respect to things of a temporal nature, but to the exercise of the priesthood as head of the true church of God, he acknowledged the force of his arguments, admitted his right, and said, For thou rulest before God, and before man thou hast prevailed; see 26th verse.

25. The hollow of Jacob's thigh was out of joint. This has been understood to mean that the hollow cup, or acetabulum of the os coxendicis, the hip-bone wherein the head of the thigh bone is received, was actually put out of joint by the angel as they were wrestling. In order to shew that no such circumstance is recorded by the sacred writer, we only need to examine the original Hebrew; for here all the translations are lamentably defective: and the best of all reasons which can be assigned for this discrepancy is, that the translators, immediately after the dispersion of the Jews, knew little or nothing of the Hebrew language; it was only in the hands of the Jews, as we learn from Jerome, who was assisted by a Jew in his revision of the earlier translations. The first Christian translation was made by Symmachus; and Jerome, 200 years after him, attempted to correct the old Latin translation of the Septuagint. As to the European translators, they have followed the translations of Jerome and the Vulgate, which do not deserve the name of translations; for we know that these, and not the Hebrew, have been resorted to; that the present translations are but copies; and that no translation has been made expressly from the Hebrew for near 1700 years.

The translators having principally followed the erroneous translations of Jerome and the Vulgate, wherever they have done so without consulting the Hebrew, particularly in the ancient part of scripture, and in the prophets, they have introduced views which the sacred writer never had, have opened the mouth of infidelity, and have laid a foundation for endless controversy.

The first words which require our attention are in the last part of the first proposition, *וַיִּקַּח בְּתֵפוֹ* *yikach betaph yereko*, he touched the hollow of his thigh: but *בְּתֵפוֹ* *betaph*, means the hand, and with *ב* *bet* prefixed, with, or in the hand, Ezek. xxi. 24; Jud. vi. 18; Isa. lxii. 3. The word *יֵרֶקוֹ* *yereko*, which is rendered *his thigh*, when having a reference to the divine command, to be fruitful and multiply, is to be

ascendeth: but he said; I will not send thee, surely, except thou bless me.

27 Then he said to him, What is thy name? and he replied, Jacob.

28 And he said, Thy name will not be again

translated as it is in Exod. i. 5, the loins, viz. *And all the souls that came out of the loins of Jacob*; Gen. xlix. 26, *Which came out of his loins*. And when the *vau* which is prefixed to *yigang*, is noticed, which is not in the old translation, the clause containing the first proposition reads, *When he saw that he prevailed not against him, then he touched his loin with the hand*.

The second proposition in the original *וַיַּקְרַע יַעֲקֹב יָדָא* *yakeekang kaph yereke*, is thus translated in the authorized version, *and the hollow of the thigh was out of joint*; but there are no words in the Hebrew of this passage for, *out of joint*. These words mean, *clap the hand*; see *Ps. xlvii. 1*, *וַיִּקְרַע יַדְּכֶם* *tiqneou kaph*, *clap your hands*; *Nah. iii. 19*, *וַיִּקְרַע יַדְּכֶם* *tiqneou kaph*, *clap the hands*. Thus in the passage under consideration it alludes to the custom of settling an agreement by an oath to perform any thing, which was done by clapping the hand on the loin; Gen. xlvii. 29, *And Abraham said, Put, I pray thee, thy hand under my thigh*—*xxiv. 9*, *And the servant put his hand under the thigh (loin) of Abraham his lord, and swore to him concerning that matter*. The verse will then read agreeably to the intention of the sacred writer, thus: *And when he saw that he prevailed not against him, he touched the hollow of his loin, yea he clapped the hand on the loin of Jacob after he had contended with him*. That is, he took the customary oath to perform what Jacob requested, viz. to justify him, that a reconciliation might be accomplished between him and his brother. For Jacob having explained himself to the satisfaction of the judge concerning his claim, that his birthright was for the succession of the priesthood, and not for the property of his father, we find that all animosity had ceased, and reciprocal acts of kindness were experienced between them.

30. *I have seen God face to face*; see verses 24, 25.

32: *And he halted upon his thigh*. I have endeavoured to understand this passage in the translations, but how Jacob could *halt upon his thigh*, is not any way intelligible; therefore it cannot be the meaning of the sacred writer. The word *וַיַּקְרַע* *yereke*, rendered *his thigh*, means also the side of any thing which projects from the main body of the thing mentioned; the extremity immediately connected with the main body; therefore it is applied to mean the coast, side, or border of a country; *Jud. xix. 18*; *Gen. xlix. 13*, *his border*; *2 Kings xix. 23*; *Ps. xlviii. 2*; *Isa. xiv. 15*;—*xxxvii. 24*; *Jer. xiv. 32*;—*xxxi. 8*; *Jon. i. 5*; *Ezek. xxxviii. 6*; *ver. 15*, *parts*. The above words, *he halted upon his thigh*, are applied by the sacred writer to the coast, or border of the country of Esau, bounded by the river Jabbok; which he had passed over in the night, *ver. 22*; where he halted, or rested, with his company, *וַיִּשְׁכַּח יַעֲקֹב* *yakeekang kaph yereke*, upon his (Esau's) border; that he might not be surprised in case Esau should be hostile. The 24th to the 31st verse, then informs us, that when the messengers arrived, and Jacob had made his case plain before the judge, viz. the man with whom he contended, at sun-rising he passed over Peniel, where he had rested with his company, being now assured by the judgment of the judge, that Esau, who was the ruler of the country, would now be reconciled; and they proceeded on their journey to meet him. Thus it appears evident, that Jacob did not wrestle with an immortal

called Jacob, but surely Israel: because thou rulest before God, and with men, also thou hast prevailed.

29 Now Jacob asked, for he had said, Declare I pray thee thy name; but he replied, For what

being sent down from heaven—a thing altogether impossible; that the narrative in the original is perfectly consistent with reason; and that the sacred writer had no other design than that of shewing how, by the explanation which Jacob gave before the judge, the primogeniture, or birthright, the sacred office of the priesthood for the appearance of Messiah in his line, was that which was confirmed on him by the blessing of his father. For, as has been said, to suppose that the way which God had appointed from the beginning to commune with man from between the Cherubim, was not equal to bring about all the purposes of his dispensations, is to conclude that some things were not foreseen, and which his omnipotence and omnipotence were not capable of effecting.

Nothing more inconsistent with the intention of the sacred writer could have been introduced by the translator. The reason given in the translation why the children of Israel did not eat of the relaxing sinew of the animal was, *because the angel touched the hollow of Jacob's thigh*. The reason given in the translation why they did not eat of this part, is a weak one; there is no ground for their having so great a veneration for a being who maimed the patriarch by such an unwarrantable action as that of putting his thigh out of joint, that he might overcome him, when he wrestled with him, as he began to find Jacob too strong for him; I say there could be no veneration for this person, who had done this serious injury to Jacob, which could induce the children of Israel not to eat that part of the animal. On the other hand, there is no good reason for withholding them from eating it on the part of Jacob, as he appears by the translation to have been so dangerously injured by his antagonist, that he was obliged to stop till he recovered. In short, if we look at it in any shape as it stands in the translations, it is unworthy of a place in the sacred scriptures, and it is not only inconsistent with the original, but it is also contradictory to other parts of the sacred history.

That something of a different nature to that which has hitherto been understood is meant here, must be plain. The reader will remark that in the received translation of the 25th verse, it is said concerning the person who wrestled with Jacob, *and when he saw that he prevailed not against him*: but in the 28th verse, it is declared by the same person, who is understood to have been an angel from heaven, that Jacob prevailed; and he said, *Thy name shall be no more Jacob, but Israel*; for as a prince hast thou power with God and with men, and hast prevailed. Now those who are determined to abide by the common translation, are under the necessity of admitting that there is a plain contradiction in the narrative, for if the angel prevailed against Jacob, as it is said in the 25th verse, Jacob could not have prevailed against the angel, as is stated in the 28th verse. As to the manner of administering the oath, it differs from any thing of the kind in use among us, but it was the custom of the eastern people at that day; and it may perhaps appear equally as strange to the people of the East at this day, that the nations of the West confirm the most solemn of all oaths by kissing the Bible.

Among the most ancient people we have seen that it was the custom, when they took a solemn oath, to clap the hand on the thigh (loins), but unless we attend to the origin of this custom, as

reason askest thou after my name? and he blessed him there.

30 Therefore Jacob called the name of the place, Peniel; for I have revered God face to face; and thou hast delivered my soul.

31 Now the sun rose upon him, as he passed before Peniel; and he reclined upon his border.

32 For this cause, the children of Israel eat not of the relaxing sinew, which is upon the

some reason must be assigned for it; we shall still be in the dark concerning the meaning, and the propriety of the application to Jacob, and the person with whom he contended; agreeably to the intention of the sacred writer.

This custom of clapping the hand on the thigh (loins) among these ancient people when they engaged to fulfil a contract, was to ratify the agreement, and to shew that they considered an oath taken before God, as the most solemn of all engagements; for, if false, they called on God to witness a lie. Thus we find this confirmed; Josh. ix. 20, *because of the oath which we swore unto them*; Jud. xxi. 7, *seeing we have sworn by the Lord*. David had sworn by the Lord that he would spare Shimei, and at his death he enjoined Solomon not to injure him, (as will be shewn.)

But the origin of this custom of clapping the hand on the thigh among the ancient Hebrews, does not appear to have been understood in modern times. If it had no other signification than that of simply clapping the hand on the thigh, it might with equal propriety have been clapped on any other part of the body. This ancient custom evidently had its origin from Gen. i. 28, *And God said to Adam, Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth*. This command concerning the generation of man, was handed down by the first men, as a most sacred command: it was most religiously observed by the true worshippers of God; and, when confined to that order which God established at the beginning, is calculated to ensure the peace and happiness of public and domestic society. Therefore, whatever may be the opinion of the modern Jews, the ancient Hebrews did not eat of the *sinew which shrank*, or the *relaxing sinew*, because of some supposed hurt done to the joint of the patriarch in consequence of an angel wrestling with him, as is supposed in the common versions. But they ate not of the *spermatic artery*, which having its origin in the loins, is the *internal artery planted by infinite wisdom for the preservation of the human race*. Therefore to impress on the mind of men the sacred obligation they were under, virtuously to observe this command, because it was a divine command, those great, those holy men, the ancient Hebrews, were instructed in all their solemn engagements, to clap the hand *under the loin*. This signified to them, that they would as faithfully fulfil their engagements, as they believed that the divine command to be fruitful and multiply, was to be religiously observed by them. This is not altogether new; the learned Rabbi Solomon Isaac, in his commentary on ch. xxiv. 2, respecting the oath which Abraham required of Eleazer, says, "He that taketh an oath ought to put his hand on what has relation to a sacred command."

28. *For as a prince thou hast power with God*. This is not the sense of the original, in which there is no authority for the words, *as, hast, power*: it is indefinite, but the Hebrew informs us concerning the nature of the office filled by Jacob at that period; for it does not follow that because a man is a

hollow of the thigh, to this day: because he touched the hollow of the loin of Jacob, on the sinew that relaxes.

CHAP. XXXIII.

THEN Jacob raised his eyes, and looked, when behold Esau came, and four hundred men with him; so he divided the children to Leah, and to Rachel; also to the two maidens.

prince, that he has power to prevail with God; which is evidently the meaning in the vulgar version.

The word *נָסַב* *saribh*, rendered, *prince*, means a ruler; see Ezra x. 14, *our rulers*; Exod. xviii. 21; 1 Kings, ix. 22, *rulers*: But a man may be a *ruler*, or a *chief*, and yet not a *prince*; which was the case.

נָסַב *Grim*, is rendered by *with*: it has this signification, but not with this construction, as it does not give the sense of the original. It therefore requires the same rendering as in 1 Sam. ii. 21, *And the child Samuel grew before the Lord*. The sacred writer informs us, that the person who contended with Jacob, referred to the office of Jacob, who was the successor to the priesthood, the *primate*, the *chief*, or *ruler*, in that department. The clause truly reads, *For thou rulest before God, and before men, moreover thou hast prevailed*.

30. *For I have seen God face to face*. When the reader recollects that the person here spoken of in the common version, as having been seen by Jacob face to face, was no other than the unmanifested Jehovah, he must necessarily be convinced that the translation is incorrect; because in the divine communication it is said, *Thou canst not see my face, for there shall no man see me and live; but my face shall not be seen*, Exod. xxxiii. 20, 23.

The error has arisen from the improper translation of the verb *רָאִיתִי* *ra'ithi*, which is rendered, *I have seen*, viz. *I have seen God*. Wherever this word is connected with *אלהים* *Elohyim*, God, as describing the infinite and incomprehensible Jehovah, to have been seen by finite man, there can be no doubt but that it is an erroneous translation, for the reason above given. This word, agreeably to the intention of the writer, means to *converse*, to have *respect*, *regard*, to *revere*, with awful aspect. Job xx. 7, *they who have seen* (Heb. revered) *him*; for Job was a priest, revered by the people, and Zophar applies the word to him, Prov. xxv. 7, *whom thine eyes have seen*, (Heb. revered); Isa. xvi. 10, *and will not behold*, (Heb. revere) *the majesty of Jehovah*. This will give us the true meaning, and which makes it consistent with other parts of scripture.

NOTES ON CHAP. XXXIII.

1. After the reconciliation which had taken place between Jacob and Esau on the investigation of his claim, as in the former chapter, we have no authority for supposing that there was any hostility on the part of Esau toward his brother when he came forth to meet him with his four hundred men, as some commentators have concluded. The judge appointed by Esau had met Jacob; Jacob had contended with him, by shewing that he had no claim on the hereditary property of his father; he only claimed the office of the priesthood, and thus he prevailed. The judge declared his cause to be just, and Esau then came with the affection of a brother, and to do him honour by protecting him to Seir; consequently there is not any authority here for representing Esau as a wicked man.

2 Moreover he put the maidens with their children foremost: then Leah with her children after them; but Rachel and Joseph hindmost.

3 Then he passed, before them, and bowed himself to the earth seven times, till he drew near to his brother.

4 Now Esau ran to meet him, then he embraced him; and he fell upon his neck, and kissed him: and they wept.

5 Then he raised his eyes, and saw the women and the children; and he said, Who are these with thee? and he answered, The children whom God hath given to thy servant.

6 And behold the maidens drew near with their children, and bowed themselves.

7 Now Leah also with her children drew near, and bowed themselves; then afterward, Joseph and Rachel drew near, and they bowed themselves.

8 Moreover he said, Whose with thee is all this present which I met? and he answered, To find favour in the sight of my lord.

9 And Esau said, I have abundance about me: my brother take that to thee for thyself.

10 But Jacob said, Nay I pray thee, if now I have found favour in thy sight; then receive my present from my hand: forasmuch as I

have seen thy face, as perceiving the presence of God, and thou hast accepted me.

11 Take I pray thee my blessing, which is brought for thee; for God hath favoured me, and because I have plenty: thus he urged him, and he received it.

12 Then he said, We will depart, and journey: and I will go before thee.

13 But he said to him, My lord knoweth that the children are tender; also the flocks and herds with young are with me; if they overdrive them one day; then die, all the flock.

14 My lord will pass now, ~~before the face~~ of his servant: and I will lead on gently, according to the feet of the cattle which are before me, and according to the feet of the children; till that I come to my lord of Seir.

15 Then Esau said; I will leave now with thee, some of the people who are with me: but he said, Why is this? I shall find favour in the sight of my lord.

16 So Esau returned that day, on his way to Seir.

17 Now Jacob went forward to Succoth, where he built for himself, a house: and for his cattle he made booths; accordingly so the name of the place was called, Succoth.

2. *And he put the handmaids and their children foremost.* It is not strange that those commentators who have not acquainted themselves with the customs of these ancient people, should suppose that by this arrangement Jacob was yet apprehensive that Esau might intend to injure them, and that if any evil befel the foremost, those for whom he had the greater regard might escape. This was the fear of Jacob when his messenger returned, ver. 6; but when he had convinced the judge that he had no claim to the temporal possessions of his father, ver. 25, his fear subsided. This arrangement was made agreeably to the custom of the country, for when a superior was approached by a person of equal rank, messengers, or those of inferior condition, were sent to announce his coming. Therefore the maidens of Leah and Rachel first drew near to Esau, and then Leah took the lead of Rachel as the eldest sister.

3. *And bowed himself seven times.* Commentators have thought that this act of humiliation on the part of Jacob was only to gain his favour, that he might not kill him. Undoubtedly there was sufficient ground in the first instance for him to form such a conclusion, because Esau had declared it to be his intention. Esau had supposed that Jacob meant to claim the principal inheritance of his father as it is said, *I have made him thy lord*. But Jacob had satisfied the judge that he had no such intention, and that this lordship only meant the priesthood, which was to be in his line. It only remained for Jacob to confirm this, not only before his own family, but before the principal men of Edom, who, on the report of the judge with whom Jacob had made his claim only to the priesthood, came to witness this public confession on the part of Jacob. And this

confirmation, agreeably to the custom of the eastern nations, was by bowing seven times to the person who was the superior.

10. *As though I had seen the face of God.* But there is no authority for the words *though I had*: there is no subjunctive mood—no pluperfect tense—no pronoun of the first person; neither does *נראו kiroth* mean literally to see the face of God. The common version makes it appear that Jacob was in the habit of seeing the face of God; but we have seen that this could not be, therefore we must look for an understanding of this word which will be in conformity with the declarations of the sacred writer respecting the manifestations of the Divine Majesty. The word *נראו kiroth*, agreeably to its orthography and construction, has a variety of applications: as to see, provide, regard, consider, perceive. But because it has been rendered by seeing, the idea of seeing by external vision has been communicated.

This word, when applied to those circumstances and things which are necessarily beyond the power of natural vision, means that action of the mind which the Latins called *perception*, viz. consciousness; that state of mind when made sensible of the thing in question, though not an object of external vision. Jacob was the acknowledged successor to the priesthood by all the church throughout the East; and in this verse he refers to his office when he received the divine communication from above the Cherubim in the Holy of Holies, where he perceived—was made sensible of the presence of God; see Num. vii. 89.

Receive my present. A custom still prevalent in the East—sent to ensure favour to the sender: if accepted, the party gains his wish; but if not, the petition is generally rejected.

18 ¶ Then Jacob came to Shalem, a city of Shechem, which is in land of Canaan; in his coming from Padan-aram: where he abode before the city.

19 There he bought a portion of land, where he had pitched his tabernacle, at the hand of the son of Hamor, the father of Shechem: for a hundred lambs.

20 Also he erected there an altar: and he preached before him; the mighty God of Israel.

And thou wast pleased with me. Urum va thirteenth, is rendered, and thou wast pleased with me; but this is not the meaning; nor is there any authority for with. The literal translation is, and thou hast accepted me.

12. *Let us take, &c.* The word נסע נישגח, is translated, let us take our journey. This is not correct; there is no second person mentioned in the awkward manner as it stands in the vulgar version, viz. let us take our journey, and let us go, and I will go. There is no authority for let. Heb. *We will depart and journey, and I will go before thee.*

18. *Jacob came to Shalem.* Some Commentators have said, that the word שאלם Shalem, should have been translated peace, safety; because the word means peace; and Jacob got to that city in safety. But this was the name of the city before Jacob came there, and this had been its name from its beginning; therefore it does not follow, because Coverdale and Matthews, and a few others who have not sufficiently acquainted themselves with the original and the history, have said so, that the name of this city should have been rejected, and the word applied to Jacob. It would be a violation of the rules of the language, there is no preposition to the word שאלם Shalem, and as it is a noun in construction, the common version is right. Many commentators have also said, "It is not likely to have been a city, as it is no where else to be found." It certainly is the duty of commentators to be better acquainted both with the language in which the scriptures are written, and with the history, before they so grossly commit themselves; otherwise, what dependance can be placed on their comments? It shews that their zeal for writing has not been corrected by knowledge. We find that there was a city called שאלם Salem, (Heb. Shalem) in the time of Abraham, Gen. xiv. 18, Melchisedek king of Salem; also Psa. lxxvi. 2. The reason why these commentators have committed this error appears evident, they have been guided by the English translation only, for the very same word in the above passages is rendered Salem, which in this verse is translated Shalem. And thus, without examining the original, they have unwisely said, "It is not likely to have been a city, as it is no where else to be found."

20. *And he erected there an altar.* Thus Jacob began here to exercise the duties of his office among this people, as the next in succession as the patriarch; for among this people there were many who were worshippers of God agreeably to the faith, rites, and ceremonies established by Abraham. And yet it appears that the idolaters governed the country. One thing we may remark here, which is worthy of imitation by all those who exercise a dominion over the minds of others on religious subjects, no inquisitorial supreme authority, a sure proof of the downfal of empty profession, had given the Sauls of the day power to persecute the true worshippers of God, to consign the innocent to dungeons, and myriads to the chambers of death; no hierarchical oligarchy supported, not

THEN went forth Dinah, daughter of Leah; whom she bare to Jacob; to converse with the daughters of the land.

2 Now Shechem the son of Hamor, the Hivite, prince of the land, had seen her: and he took her, moreover he lay with her, and he forced her.

3 Yea his soul clave, to Dinah, the daughter of Jacob: for he loved the damsel; and he spake to the heart of the damsel.

by truth, but by the sword, had issued its decrees to force all people to bow to the idols of the land; no anathemas had been thundered against the lives, privileges, property, and liberties, of those who were not under the spiritual controul of the reigning religious dynasty; the spirit of intolerance had not poisoned the minds of the idolaters of Canaan. Those heathens allowed Jacob not only to purchase land, but also to build an altar for the worship of God.

20. *And he called it El-elhoe Israel.* There is no information conveyed in these words, as none but Hebrew scholars can possibly know what is meant by he called it El-elhoe Israel. The word לוּ lo, is rendered by the neuter pronoun it, but which cannot be allowed; there was no necessity for it, nor was there any authority for it. This word consists of לוּ lamed, which prefixed, or in its simple order, with this construction, means before, and the וּ vau, becomes the masculine pronoun, him, as in other parts of scripture. It reads, before him. I have observed, that the word קרא qara, which is translated, to call, has various applications and modes of expression, as, to declare, call, cry, publish, read, proclaim, preach, see Lev. xiv. 10; Deut. xx. 10;—xxxii. 3, proclaim; 1 Kings, xiii. 4, cry; Neh. vi. 7, preach. The word מַעַל maal means, mighty, powerful, see Gen. xxxi. 29; Deut. xxviii. 32; Neh. v. 5; Mich. ii. 1. And with the two nouns following in construction, this clause reads, The mighty God of Israel. Jacob had now bought the land of the son of Hamor, the governor of the country: he had built a house, he had erected an altar, where he preached before him, the mighty God of Israel.

NOTES ON CHAP. XXXIV.

1. *And Dinah—went out to see the daughters of the land.* Commentators have not determined why Dinah went to see the daughters of the land, but have thought with Josephus, that it must have been at one of their festivals. This cannot be allowed, for it is not at all likely that Jacob, who was the patriarch of the true church of God, and a preacher against the idolatry of the land, would suffer his daughter to be present at any of the heathen festivals, which they kept in honour of their idol. Jacob had now been some years in the neighbourhood of Shalem, and as he was on good terms with Hamor the prince, there can be no doubt but that Dinah was allowed to pay his family a visit.

7. *He had wrought folly in Israel.* This translation is evidently incorrect, because Israel as a nation was not in existence; therefore the בֵּת beth prefixed to Israel, cannot be rendered by in, but by before, as it is in ch. xxiii. 18.

Which thing ought not to be done. This last clause is not consistent with the Hebrew, the person of the verb is omitted, and there is neither necessity nor authority for the translators to say, which thing ought not to be done; as not only the sons

4 Then Shechem spake, to Hamor his father, saying: Get for me this female, for a wife.

5 Now Jacob heard that he had polluted Dinah his daughter; and his sons were with his cattle in the field; but he secretly devised till they came.

6 Then Hamor the father of Shechem, went forth to Jacob, to speak with him.

7 Now the sons of Jacob came from the field, when they heard; and the men grieved themselves; but grew exceeding angry: because he had wrought folly before Israel, to lie with the daughter of Jacob; which thing must not be continued.

8 So Hamor spake with them saying: The soul of Shechem my son, longeth for your daughter; give ye her now to him for a wife.

9 Thus cause affinity with us; your daughters give ye to us; and our daughters, receive ye to you.

10 Then ye shall dwell with us, for the land shall be before you; abide ye, and traffick ye; yea obtain ye possessions therein.

11 Also Shechem said to her father, and to her brethren; Shall I find favour in your sight? then what ye shall say, to me, I will give.

12 Increase ye to me exceedingly, dowry, or gift; for I will give her, according as ye shall say to me: now give ye to me, the damsel for a wife.

of Jacob, but also the people of Shalem, knew that this was an abominable crime.

וַיַּעַן *Yeegnaash*, is the third person singular future of the verb, which means to *fulfil, perform, prepare, execute, maintain*, &c. agreeably to the idiom. And as the sons of Jacob had determined that Shechem should not have their sister, though he now kept her confined in his own house; this word should be translated as it is in Psal. cxl. 12, *maintain*. The obvious application is, that he should not be permitted to *maintain* his claim to the person of Dinah.

12. *Ask me never so much dowry and gift*. A very imperfect and awkward translation. There is no word which can with any propriety be rendered by *ask*; for *חָבַשׁ* *harbou*, means to *multiply*, Amos iv. 4, *increase*; Ezek. xxxvi. 37. *מָעוֹד* *Meod*, means *exceedingly*, Gen. vii. 19; and in the word *וּמָתָן* *vu mathaan*, rendered, *and gift*, is the *וּ* *mem*, and the *וּ* *vau* as prefixes; but the *וּ* *mem*, which is very important, is not noticed in the common version, so that the whole meaning and application is not known. The literal translation of this is, *and even gift*. We have seen that it was a custom with these people to give a dowry to the woman, which was providing for her and her offspring; but in addition to this, Shechem, who appears to have been sorry for his conduct, offers Jacob and his family great gifts; and the gifts of a prince would not be trifling, they were un-

13 Then the sons of Jacob answered Shechem and his father Hamor, with guile, when they spake; because he forced, Dinah their sister.

14 Therefore they said to them, We cannot do this thing, to give our sister, to a man who is uncircumcised; because this were a reproach to us.

15 Nevertheless in this we consent to you; if ye will be the same, to circumcise among you, every male;

16 Then we will give our daughters to you, and we will take your daughters among us: and we will dwell with you, so we shall become one people.

17 But if ye hearken not to us, concerning the circumcision; then we will take our daughter, and depart.

18 Now their words were good, in the sight of Hamor, and in the sight of Shechem the son of Hamor.

19 For the youth stayed not, but he did the thing; because he delighted in the daughter of Jacob: Now he was honoured, above all the house of his father.

20 Then Hamor came, with Shechem his son, to the gate of their city; and they spake to the men of their city, saying;

21 These are peaceable men with us, therefore they shall dwell in the land and traffick

limited; for he said, *Increase unto me exceedingly dowry, and even gift*.

13. *Answered deceitfully, and said*. In the common version the translators have put in a parenthesis, and even then the verse is entirely out of order; for the words, *and said*, either mean that the following clause was spoken to Shechem and Hamor, or the same words are repeated at the beginning of the next verse, which, if read without the parenthesis, would be read thus, *and said, and they said unto them*.

The verb *וַיַּעַן* *vu yagannan*, rendered, *and answered*, was understood by the sacred writer as spoken by the sons of Jacob at a former part of the conversation; and therefore it carries the accentual mark of the pluperfect tense, viz. *Now the sons of Jacob had answered*.

בְּמַרְמָה *Bemirmah*, is rendered by *deceitfully*. But the *ב* *beth* prefixed, which is omitted in the common version, here literally means *with*. It reads, *with guile*, or *with deceit*.

The verse is not properly divided, for *וַיַּעַן וַיֹּאמֶר* *vu ye dabeerou* rendered, *and said*, finishes the major proposition; but in the common version it is made a part of the second; and with the *וּ* *vau* prefixed, which refers for time to a former part of the conversation, it does not read as in the common version: *And the sons of Jacob answered Shechem and Hamor his father deceitfully, and said, but, Now the sons of Jacob had answered Shechem and Hamor their father with guile, when they*

therein; for behold the extensive limit of the land is before them: their daughters shall be taken among us for wives; and our daughters shall be given to them.

22 The men will agree with us only in this, to dwell with us; to be even one people: by circumcising among us, every male, as they are circumcised.

23 Their property, even their cattle, yea every beast of theirs, will be for us; surely it shall be granted to them, if they will dwell with us.

24 Thus they hearkened to Hamor, and to Shechem his son; all going out of the gate of his city: so they circumcised every male, all going out of the gate of his city.

25 Now it was on the third day when they

SPACE. The last clause then reads consistently, without the parenthesis, which is not in the original.

19. *A hundred pieces of money.* *nowp kesitah*, is rendered pieces of money; but this is not a compound word, nor is there any word for *pieces*, or for *money*, though made a part of the text in the common version. This word means *lambs*, and should be so translated in every place of scripture where it occurs. Thus in Job xlii. 12, it is said, that the Lord blessed the latter end of Job more than his beginning, for he had fourteen thousand sheep; and the former verse, where this word occurs, gives the reason, viz. Every man also gave him a lamb: so the Septuagint and the Vulgate render it; there being no words here for *piece of money*, as in the passage under consideration.

25. *Simeon and Levi.* These two sons of Jacob are the only ones mentioned as concerned in this business; but we are not to conclude that they could have overcome the inhabitants of the city, even in the state they were in, without assistance; the women without the aid of the men would have put a stop to it. It does not appear likely that all the sons of Jacob could have done it unless they had been assisted. Thus we are informed in the following verses, that the sons of Jacob spoiled the city—took their sheep, oxen, asses—that which was in the city, and in the field—all their wealth—took their little ones, and their wives captive—and spoiled all that was in the house. From which it will appear that all this could not have been done by two men, or by ten men: the alarm would soon have been general, and the defenders of this city, the chief residence of the prince, would have been irresistible.

Jacob had brought with him from Padan-aram great substance; his flocks and herds were exceedingly numerous: the present given to Esau is a proof of this; it was a princely present, which is stated to be, that which came to his hand, ch. xxxii. meaning, out of his great abundance. Therefore he must have had a great number of servants to manage his property. We are told that Abraham armed above three hundred born in his own house; and as the living property of Jacob appears to have far exceeded that of Abraham, his servants also must have been more in number, and these were they who enabled the sons of Jacob to punish the Shechemites; for the irreparable injury and disgrace done to their sister.

It does not appear however in the original, that the sons of

were sore, that two sons of Jacob, Simeon and Levi, brethren of Dinah, took each his sword; then they came upon the city, secretly: and slew every male.

26 Yea even Hamor and Shechem his son, they slew with the edge of the sword; then they took Dinah from the house of Shechem, and departed.

27 The sons of Jacob came upon the wounded, yea they plundered the city; because they defiled their sister.

28 Their flocks and their herds, also their he-asses; even all that was in the city, and that was in the field, they took.

29 Yea all their wealth, even their young, and the substance of their women, they took, or spoiled: even all that was in the house.

Jacob slew all the males in the city, as is represented in the common version; for after it is said in the 26th verse, that they slew all the males, the 27th verse says, and they slew Hamor and Shechem; which remark would have been unnecessary had all the males in the city been slain. It evidently refers to the chief men of Shechem, who sanctioned the outrage by their silence in not bringing the offender to justice; whose property they confiscated and destroyed, and on whom they inflicted the punishment of that law, provided in all civilized nations for the security of defenceless individuals, which at this day punishes such offenders with death.

29. *Their little ones and their wives took they captive.* It does not however appear from any part of the history in the original, that the sons of Jacob took either the little ones or the wives of the Shechemites captive, though it is so positively declared in the common version. When Jacob removed to Bethel from this place, he took only his own family, as he was directed; the man who was afraid that the rest of the people would rise upon them and destroy them, was certainly not in a situation to take all the little ones and the wives in a great city into captivity, who would have been an useless burden to them had they had a sufficiency for the support of so great a number of people. This is a thing not to be credited; nor shall we find that it was as it is represented in the common version.

The first error made by the translators in this verse, is made abundantly in every page of the Bible, viz. they have run the first proposition into the second, and the last word of the second proposition into the third; so that by this gross inattention to the rules of the language, the whole verse is inconsistent with the original, contrary to the common dictates of humanity, and in direct opposition to the practice of sacred patriarchal ages.

The word *na eth*, which literally means the substance of the thing mentioned, viz. *their wealth*, occurs three times in the first proposition, but which is altogether omitted in the common version. Thus it refers to the substance of the house of Hamor and Shechem, of their relatives and dependants only, who had sanctioned the crime of Shechem. The clause reads, *Now the substance of their wealth, even the substance of their youth, and the substance of their women.* Here *katon* is upon *neshechem*, women, which ends the first proposition.

30 Then Jacob said to Simeon and to Levi, Ye have distressed me, even made me abominable to the inhabitant of the land; before the Canaanite, and the Perizzite: now I am few in number, therefore they will assemble against me, and smite me, then I shall be overthrown, I and my house.

31 And they said; Shall he treat our sister as a harlot?

CHAP. XXXV.

THEN God said, to Jacob; Arise, ascend to Beth-el, also dwell there: then prepare

Took they captive and spoiled. Thus are the words *וַיִּקְחוּ וַיַּשְׁלִיכוּ* *shaabou va yaabozou*, translated. Here the *Atrah* which is on the last word, *yaabozou*, shews the end of the second, or major proposition; which word is most injudiciously put into the third proposition in the common version. And this also shews that it does not belong to the third proposition; consequently it cannot refer to the little ones and the women in the first proposition, but to the substance of those people who were the aggressors.

וַיִּקְחוּ *Shaabou* is not in the original applied to mean a captivity, unless it be said that the people were carried away out of their own land. The word is *one*; it is the third person plural preter of the verb to take, or carry, literally, *they took*, not *took they captive*. The word *yaabozou* is translated right in the common version, but the *vav*, prefixed, should be rendered as in Exod. xxi. 15, *He that smiteth his father, on his mother*. Thus it is evident, that the charge which objectors have brought against the patriarch, for taking the women and children captives, is altogether without foundation.

NOTES ON CHAP. XXXV.

2. *And Jacob said unto his house.* It is understood agreeably to the common version, that the house of Jacob at this time worshipped idols. What! the family of the man who had been brought up in the knowledge and the fear of God, the successor to the high situation of the priesthood, the head of the church at the death of Isaac, and who received the divine communication from above the Cherubim—a countenance of idolatry in his own family! This cannot for a moment be admitted.

In the first verse Jacob was commanded to go to Beth-el, and there to put in order the altar, and to offer sacrifices. But here the translators have erred, as they have run the first proposition into the second. There is the stop *kath*, on *mindeech*, i. e. *altar*; which finishes the proposition; therefore the following words, *לַיהוָה* *laa el*, rendered, *to God*, cannot be joined with it, as they are in the common version, because they are in the second proposition. For Jacob, who was a preacher of the truth, to be told to build an altar to God, would be obviously unnecessary and improper, as he never built altars to idols. So that the *lamed*, prefixed to *laa el*, *God*, should be rendered by the word *for*, as it is in other scriptures.

The 2nd verse then begins with this command, which is connected with the 1st verse by the *vav*, and refers to this command to go to Beth-el, viz. *וַיֹּמַר* *va yomer*, which Jacob communicated to his house: and here the first proposition ends at *וּבְתֵלָה* *beetho*, his house, or his own family.

And to all that were with him. *וְכָל* *va al*, beginning the

there an altar before God, who appeared to thee, in thy flying, from the face of Esau thy brother.

2 Also Jacob said to his household, and to all who were with him: Remove ye the god of the stranger, which is in the midst of you; and be ye purified; then change your garments.

3 For we will arise and ascend, to Beth-el: again I will prepare there an altar before God, who answered me in the day of my distress; and was with me, in the way that I went.

4 So they gave to Jacob, even every god of the stranger which was in their hand; and the ear-

second proposition, is rendered, *and to*; the *vav*, here is adverbative, there being a transition to another subject in a distinct proposition; and therefore it should be rendered by *but*, viz. *but unto all that were with him*. To the Syrians in his service he said—

Put away the strange gods. These Syrians to whom Jacob said, *put away the strange gods*, were superstitious carriers of images of some of their great and notified men and women who had been sainted, and who they were of opinion would protect them, if they paid a kind of worship to them. Such was the notion in after ages, see Jon. i. 5, *and cried every man unto his god*.

But a question naturally arises here, How then was it that Laban said to Jacob, ch. xxi. 30, *Wherefore hast thou stolen my god?* And verse 34th, *Now Rachel had taken the images*. Not that Rachel worshipped the image. It cannot be supposed that Jacob, who was by right at the head of the priesthood, would allow any part of his household to worship an idol. If we turn our attention to the early period of the patriarchal church, we shall find that the worshippers, no doubt from a sincere zeal, had formed something like the Cherubim, which they kept in their houses, and by attributing to them things inconsistent with the order which God had established to communicate with man from above the Cherubim, in the holy place, thus brought on a neglect of public worship. This appears from the first verse, where we find that Jacob was commanded to go to Beth-el, to the place of worship before the altar. By which it appears that they were not idolaters. Notwithstanding, the superstitious regard for these images was not compatible with the pure order of the divine worship which God had commanded in the laws given to Noah, renewed by Abraham, and promulgated by Isaac. Hence we learn that in after ages when the people departed from the express letter of the sacred code, they fell into all those enthusiastic notions which gave birth to idolatry among the Israelites, when they said, *Thus saith the Lord—whereas the Lord had not spoken*.

The word *נִכְשֵׁת* *neeshar*, rendered *strange*, is certainly not an adjective, it is a substantive, applied to the foreigners who were with them. See where the same word with the *n* prefixed is properly so rendered, Isa. lvi. 3, 6, *the son of the stranger*; Gen. xvii. 12; Lev. xxii. 25; Ezek. xlv. 9, &c. And so it is thus translated generally, as it ought to be throughout the scripture. Neither is *אֱלֹהִים* *Elohees*, rendered *gods*, a plural noun in the common version. The clause literally reads, *the God of the foreigner*. This is the same as the Hebrew; there was no necessity to alter the syntax; the two nouns *אֱלֹהִים* *Elohees* *ha neeshar*, are in construction, and should be rendered in the

rings that were in their ears: and Jacob concealed them, under the oak which was near Shechem.

5 Then they departed: for the terror of God, was upon the cities that surrounded them, and they pursued not, after the sons of Jacob.

6 And Jacob came to Luz, which is in the land of Canaan; the same is Beth-el: he and all the people who were with him.

7 For he had there repaired the altar, also he had preached at the place, the God of BETH-EL: and there they appeared before God; like his flying from the face of his brother.

genitive case, and the *he*, i.e. *she*, prefixed to נִשְׁכָּח *neekah*, has its reading, which is not the case in the common version.

I will make there an altar. This translation cannot be correct; it will be recollected that at this place, Beth-el, the people were idolaters in the time of Abraham, and that when he had convinced them of the folly of their worship, he built an altar to God, and preached in his name, ch. xii. 8. So that at this time there was a people in this place who worshipped God, as their fathers had been taught by this great reformer of the idolatrous nations. It is also said to Jacob, ch. xxxi. 13, *I am the God of Beth-el, where thou anointedst the pillar.* This shows that during the lifetime of Isaac the worship of God was kept up at Beth-el; therefore the sacrifices, rites, and ceremonies, agreeably to that dispensation, were observed, consequently there was no necessity for Jacob to say, *I will make there an altar to God.*

The word עֲשֵׂה *ve egnesh*, is rendered in the common version, and *I will make*; but, for the reason given, a different mode of expression should have been adopted: for it embraces a variety of words in other languages, yet all partaking of the meaning of the radix. Such as, *do, make, dress, requite, offer, provide, prepare, &c.* agreeably to idiom. I therefore, in conformity with the meaning of the passage, rendered it as it is in other parts of scripture, see Psa. lvi. 15, *I will offer*; Ezek. xxxv. 6, *I will prepare*. It would be improper to say concerning the altar or sacramental table in Christian churches, *I will make a table*; but we may with propriety say, *I will prepare the table.*

4. *And all their ear-rings which were in their ears.* Commentators have not determined whether these ear-rings were taken from the ears of the images, or from the ears of the people. But the accents will show how the passage should be read, for as *hahon* is upon הֶחָוִי *he chavim*, i.e. *in their hands*, which finishes the proposition; וְהָאָזְנוֹת *ha'aznot*, i.e. *ear-rings* in the following proposition, cannot be joined with אֱלֹהֵי הַנָּכָר *Elohei ha neekar*, god of the stranger.

5. *The terror of God.* It has appeared strange to many, that the terror of God should be upon the people! Jacob, a stranger with his own people only, we are told, "was not calculated to inspire all the cities around them with terror." But it should be recollected that Jacob was the son of one of the greatest men in the land near to Shechem, who was the supreme head of the church which had been planted by Abraham, where great numbers had become worshippers of the true God; that the character of Isaac was revered because of the sacredness of his office; that Jacob was his successor in the priesthood; and that his brother was the prince of Edom. Therefore it is not surprising that the terror of God, the fear

8 Then Deborah the nurse of Rebekah died; there she was buried beneath Beth-el, in the place of the oak: and he called the name, the oaks of mourning.

9 ¶ Now God had appeared to Jacob again, at his coming from Padan-aram: and he blessed him.

10 There God said to him, Thy name is Jacob: thy name shall not be called Jacob again, but Israel shall be thy name; and he called his name Israel.

11 Moreover God said to him, I am God Almighty, be fruitful and multiply; a nation,

which his worship inspired them with, should be upon them. They also knew that the prince of Shechem had been guilty of an atrocious crime, countenanced by the men of Shechem, and who had confined the daughter of Jacob in his own house. A crime of this nature would give sufficient cause for civilized nations to go to war at this day. And therefore being sensible that the aggression was on the part of the Shechemites, they must for their own security have been convinced that some retributive justice was due as an example.

7. *And he built there an altar.* See 2 Chron. xxxiii. 16, *And he repaired.* It reals, for he had there repaired the altar, viz. at the time when he went to Padan-aram.

And he called the place. Also he had preached, see ch. xxviii. 19. לִמְקוֹם *La maakom*, reads literally, *at the place.* The *lamed* prefixed is omitted in the common version.

El-beth-el. The God of Beth-el. The obvious meaning of which is, that at the time when he left his own country to go to Padan-aram, he stopped at Beth-el, where there was a place for public worship which had been established by Abraham. The original then says, *For there he repaired the altar when he called at the place of the God of Beth-el*, which finishes the major proposition. He began to officiate as the successor to the priesthood at this Beth-el, this house, or temple of God, among the descendants of the true worshippers, who had been converted in the time of Abraham.

Thus we see that Jacob, on whom had devolved the priesthood as the head of this representative church, offered the sacrifices, and had been received in that character by Laban, and by the people of his country. This sacrifice was offered in the mount, but as the sacrifices were always offered at the altar in the tabernacle, the tabernacles being built on the tops of mountains, we learn, that on this mount there was at this period a tabernacle in the neighbourhood of which they all rested.

Because there God appeared unto him. נִגְלוּ *Niglu*, has been erroneously translated in the common version; the tense of the verb has been mistaken by the translators, who have rendered it as the third person singular preter, viz. *God appeared*, whereas it is the third person plural, and refers to the whole family of Jacob as appearing before God, agreeably to the third verse. The clause reads, *therefore they appeared there before God.*

The word בָּהֲרָחוּ *bebaarchu* is rendered *when he fled*; but the sacred writer was here comparing his flying from the face of the Shechemites to Beth-el, to his flying from the face of his brother to the same place. Signifying to him that as God protected him at that period, and had brought him safe to his own land, that he would still continue to protect him. Therefore the *2 beth* prefixed to this word requires to be translated

yea a company of nations, shall be even of thee: for kings shall go forth from thy loins.

12 And the land, which I gave to Abraham, and to Isaac, to thee I will give it; yea after thee to thy posterity, I will give the land.

13 Then God ascended from before him, in the place where he spake with him;

14 Where Jacob had erected a pillar, in the place where he spake with him, a pillar of stone, where he poured thereon a drink-offering, and cast oil thereon.

15 For Jacob had called the name of the place, where God had spoken with him there, Beth-el.

16 Then they departed from Beth-el, for there was but a short distance of land, to the entering of Ephrath; when Rachel brought forth, and she suffered in her bringing forth.

as it is in Exod. xxx. 34, like—as. The last clause literally reads, *Like his flying from the face of his brother.*

I know it is said by some Hebrew scholars, that this refers to the angels or messengers of God, who are said to have appeared to him at this tabernacle, when he fled from the face of his brother, ch. xxviii. 11; but the word *Elohyim*, which is the proper name of the DIVINE MAJESTY, is never used in any part of scripture to mean an angel, or a judge; it uniformly means God in every part of scripture. It is expressly said in this verse, *וַיֵּצֵא אֱלֹהִים אֶת יַעֲקֹב מִפָּדָן אֶרֶץ אֲרָם* *eloyim elayn Eloyim, they appeared before God; and in ch. xxviii. 12, וַיֵּצֵא אֱלֹהִים אֶת יַעֲקֹב מִפָּדָן אֶרֶץ אֲרָם* *ve hinek melakee Eloyim, and the messenger of God; from which it is obvious that the messengers of God could not be God, consequently Eloyim, God, cannot mean angels or messengers.*

When he fled from the face of his brother. *וַיֵּצֵא אֱלֹהִים אֶת יַעֲקֹב מִפָּדָן אֶרֶץ אֲרָם* *he baarcho* is rendered in the common version as the third person singular preter in *he*, when he fled; but it is the infinitive, and should be rendered, after his hastening from the presence of his brother. The word *hastening* is more consistent with the idiom of the verb, than the word *flying*. The Septuagint have thus rendered the word by the infinitive of the verb: *et tu apostolice* *in his flying.*

8. *Alon Baachuth.* Names in Hebrew have meaning; but these words give the reader no information as to their signification. The translators have retained the Hebrew pronunciation in English. The word *alon* means the oaks, or the grove where the sacrifices were prepared for public worship near Shechem, and *baachuth*, mourning. A very appropriate name, not only on account of the solemnity of the occasion, but it also shews, that at this place there was a grove where the sacrifices were prepared agreeably to ancient custom, handed by the patriarchs from Noah down to the time of Abraham. These trees, whether palm-trees, i. e. *Sinai-trees*, oaks, poplars, or elms, formed the sacrificial grove, Hos. iv. 13. From this custom we have the Druid, or Oak-priests, of Britain, Germany, Gaul, &c.

9, 10. *God appeared unto Jacob.* We have before seen that this cannot be understood according to the common acceptance of the word, because the ineffable Deity cannot be seen by the material eye; consequently this word is too strong. This

17 Now it was in her difficulty, when she brought forth; notwithstanding the midwife had said to her, Fear not, for thou shalt have this son also;

18 When her soul was departing, for she died; then she called his name, Benoni: but his father called him Benjamin.

19 Thus Rachel died, and she was buried in the way of Ephrath; the same is Bethlehem.

20 And Jacob erected a pillar upon her grave: the same is the pillar of the grave of Rachel, to this day.

21 Moreover Israel removed, and pitched a tabernacle beyond the tower of Edar.

22 Then it was, while Israel tabernacled in the land; that Reuben went, and remained with Bilhah the concubine of his father, and Israel heard it: Now the sons of Jacob were twelve.

is a reference to the time when God favoured Jacob as he came from Padan-aram with his people, when he made his cause clear before the judge, ch. xxxii. 28; therefore the remote preter is on the verb *וַיֵּצֵא* *yecrau*, which should be translated by the word *provided*; for the original word embraces every action of the mind which communicates light, or gives information. So that the words, *regard, provide, perceive, consider*, are comprehended, and used agreeably to the idiom of the verb. Thus God had directed Jacob to quit Padan-aram, and he had *provided* in the order of his providence for his security in his own country, by causing him to be reconciled to Esau. A reference to ch. xxxii. 28, 29, will shew how necessary it is to attend to the pluperfect or remote preter tense.

11 to 15. *And God said unto him.* Thus it was, agreeably to the common version, that this communication was given at this time when Jacob was with his family at Beth-el; and it is worthy of remark, that it is in perfect conformity with the communication at this tabernacle, which was given to Jacob when he left his own country, as it is recorded, ch. xxviii. 13 to 18. From the 11th to the 15th verses of this 35th chapter, every particular is mentioned which was then communicated to Jacob before this period of his return from Padan-aram, viz. *I am God Almighty—nations shall be born of thee—and Jacob set up a pillar of stone—and he poured oil thereon.* So that it appears to be absolutely necessary to attend to the pluperfect, or remote preter tense; which is so particularly pointed out in the original, and confirmed by the fact recorded in the former part of the sacred history. For we find that it is continued in these verses, viz. 11th, *Moreover God had said unto him; 14th, There Jacob had set up a pillar; 15th, For Jacob had called the name of the place Beth-el.*

The important information which may be drawn from this part of scripture is obvious. The sacred writer was directed to refer to these two communications given to Jacob: the one at Beth-el, when he went to Padan-aram; the other, when he returned to his own country; in order to shew to posterity the faithfulness of God in the accomplishment of his promises.

16. *A little way.* This phrase in English is become familiar by common usage, but it is very improper. A *way* is applied to a road on which we travel, not to distance: the road may not be little—a broad road made for passengers—it cannot be

23 The sons of Leah; Reuben the first-born of Jacob: and Simeon, and Levi, and Judah; and Issachar, and Zebulun.

24 The sons of Rachel; Joseph and Benjamin.

connected with the word *little*; even to say, a *little distance*, it would be improper. The words *ברוך ה' ארץ* *kabrath ha arets*, are used in the Rabbinical writings to mean ground which may be walked over in a quarter of a day.

17. *Benoni*. The son of my sorrow.

Benjamin. The son of my right hand.

21. *Tower of Eder*. Heb. *The tower of the flock*. This was in the neighbourhood of Bethlehem, ver. 19, a place noted for pasturage, where shepherds watched their flocks. Jonathan says in the Targum, "This is the place where Messiah the king will be manifested in the latter days." Jonathan wrote his commentary on the prophetic books, and thus he understood Mic. v. 2, *And thou Bethlehem Ephratah—out of thee shall he come forth unto me, that is to be ruler in Israel*.

22. *Reuben went and lay with Bilhah*. The common translation of this passage is altogether erroneous. Can it for a moment be supposed, that the sacred writer would make such a digression from his subject to remark, in a solitary verse, a circumstance of such a nature, unconnected with any thing past, and having no relation to any thing future, as it stands in the common version, so as to determine its meaning or application? Certainly not. Commentators have generally passed this over in silence; but a modern writer has, with a degree of candour which does him great credit, said, "Both piety and candour would rejoice could it be proved that no such thing was done."

Many of the most eminent Rabbies have said, that nothing of this nature was understood by the sacred writer. Jonathan the paraphrast, who lived in the time of Hillel, and Shamay, who lived previous to the Herodian reign, say in the Targum on this verse, *ומלך רבוע ונבלה לו מעט רבועה פלקיה* *umelach rebeu uvelela lu me'et rebeueh palkia* *and Reuben ve bilbeel yath mitsignaa de Bilhah pilaklech d Aboe de havah mesadra haal kebeel mitsigna de Leah imyeh*. "And Reuben went and overthrew the bed of Bilhah, the concubine of his father, which was set up in rivalry to that of Leah his mother." This view is also confirmed by the learned Rabbi Solomon Isaac, mostly by abbreviations, called Rashi, *סוף שכלל משכבו מלך עלי הכתר* *suf shalal meshkavo melach עלי הכתר* *mitok shebilbeel mishkaabo magnalah guataaa ha-kathob kelou shuakbuk*. "Because he overthrew his bed, the verse rebuked him, as if having committed that crime." Then Rashi continues, "What induced Reuben to do it? because when Rachel died, the bed of Jacob was placed in the dwelling of Bilhah (viz. the hereditary right of the bed of Bilhah to the priesthood, which was now in her son Dan, he being the eldest firstborn;) Reuben then claimed the privilege of his mother, viz. the birthright, saying, If the sister of my mother were a rival to my mother, why should her servant be a rival to my mother? He therefore set aside her claim." And we shall not find this far from the truth. This is a hebraism, a very significant expression; for as, agreeably to the order of that dispensation, the firstborn had a claim for the succession to the priestly office; in those ages the greatest and the most honourable situation; so Dan the firstborn of Bilhah, with Bilhah and Gad, joined to secure the priesthood. This circumstance appears to have been involved in great obscurity; but it will be seen in the note on ch. xlix. 16, that at this period, Dan, on the defection of Reuben, had succeeded to the privileges of the firstborn. He was

25 And the sons of Bilhah, maiden of Rachel; Dan and Naphtali.

26 Also the sons of Zilpah, maiden of Leah, Gad, and Asher: these sons of Jacob; were born to him in Padan-aram.

then the next firstborn till the time of Joseph; and when the evil report had reached Jacob, and he had on this account declared him to be the successor to the priesthood, then it was that Reuben seized the priesthood as the legitimate firstborn, and thus set aside the claim of Dan the son of Bilhah, in order to prevent the succession of Joseph, the firstborn of Rachel, to the priesthood, he being then the youngest son. So Reuben shewing that he had a prior right, the paraphrast says, he put aside the claim, viz. he "overthrew the bed of Bilhah," and the Jerusalem Targum confirms it. Had commentators attended to those great masters of the language, they would have given a translation in other languages conformably with the idiom of the verb *שכב* *shekab*; it would have been doing something for the credit of the scripture. But this has remained as it was first translated into the Greek and Latin languages, in the early ages of the Christian church, when the Hebrew was but very imperfectly understood by Christians; and from these translations, it is well known, all the European translations have been made.

The true understanding of this passage depends on the translation of the word *וישכב* *va shekab*, which in the common version is rendered *he laid*. Too little attention has been paid to the various applications of this verb, agreeably to the obvious sense of the narrative. Hence it is, that though we find words translated agreeably to the meaning of the radix, yet we frequently find that an improper word has been chosen, which, according to the series of the narrative, has not conveyed the meaning of the original.

שכב *Shekab*, is to be taken in any of the different acceptations of the words which signify a state of tranquillity, or rest; as, to remain, lodge, abide, settle, stop, stay: but the idea of sleep never enters into the force of this word. I therefore translate it as it is translated in Job xxxviii. 37, *who can stay the bottles of heaven?* The passage will then read in perfect conformity with the meaning of the word, and obviously according to the meaning of the sacred writer, without supposing that Reuben went and committed the abomination imputed to him in the common version with Bilhah. It is rendered to rest, to be at rest, Job iii. 19;—xiv. 12; Isa. xiv. 8, *to be fixed or situated*; Psa. lvi. 4, *I lie (am situated) even among them*; Psa. lxxviii. 13, *though ye have lien (remained) among the pots*, Heb. *sheep-folds*.

Thus from all the circumstances, as well as from the true meaning and obvious application of *שכב* *shekab*, we are authorised to conclude, that the cause of the rejection of Reuben from the priesthood was not as is supposed in the common version; but like Cain, who refusing to conform to the divine order of things after the fall, on this account was rejected from the priesthood. So Reuben, who as the firstborn would have succeeded to the priesthood, refused to conform to the state of things after the deluge, such as they were in the time of Peleg, when the division of the earth took place; which division, as has been shewn, was the division of the kingly and priestly offices, because of the relaxed state of the church; but which offices till that period had been exercised by the ruling patriarch, see ch. iv.

Now as the son of Bilhah, and the son of Zilpah, appear to have had a right also, as the firstborn, to the succession,

27 Then Jacob went to Isaac his father at Mamre, of the city of Arba: the same is Hebron; where Abraham and Isaac sojourned.

28 Now the days of Isaac were, a hundred and eighty years.

29 Thus Isaac had laboured, when he died and *was* gathered to his people; an elder and full of days: then Esau and Jacob his sons, buried him.

CHAP. XXXVI.

¶ **N**OW these *are* the generations of Esau, the same is Edom.

2 Esau took his wives from the daughters of Canaan: Adah, the daughter of Elon the Hittite; and Aholibamah the daughter of Anah; the daughter of Zibeon the Hivite.

3 And Bashemath daughter of Ishmael, sister of Nebajoth.

4 Now Adah bare to Esau, Eliphaz; and Bashemath bare Reuel.

5 And Aholibamah bare Jeush, and Jaalam, and Korah: these *were* the sons of Esau; who were born to him in the land of Canaan.

6 Now Esau took his wives, also his sons and his daughters, with all the persons of his house; likewise his cattle, and all his beasts, even all his substance, which he had gotten in the land of Canaan: and he went through the land, from the face of Jacob his brother.

7 For their substance was too great, to dwell together, and the land of their sojourning could not support them; because of their cattle.

8 So Esau dwelt in mount Seir; Esau, the same is Edom.

9 Now these *are* the generations of Esau, the father of Edom: in mount Seir.

10 These *are* the names of the sons of Esau: Eliphaz the son of Adah the wife of Esau; Reuel the son of Bashemath, the wife of Esau;

11 Now the sons of Eliphaz were: Teman, Omar, Zepho, and Gatam, and Kenaz.

12 And Timnah was concubine to Eliphaz son of Esau; and she bare to Eliphaz, Amalek: these *were* the sons of Adah, the wife of Esau.

13 And these *were* the sons of Reuel; Nahath and Zerah, Shammah and Mizzah: these were the sons of Bashemath, wife of Esau.

14 And these *were* the sons of Aholibamah, the daughter of Anah, the daughter of Zibeon, wife of Esau: and she bare to Esau, Jeush and Jaalam, and Korah.

15 These were dukes of the sons of Esau: the sons of Eliphaz first-born of Esau; duke Teman, duke Omar, duke Zepho, duke Kenar.

16 Duke Korah, duke Gatam, duke Amalek: these *were* dukes of Eliphaz, in the land of Edom; these *were* sons of Adah.

17 And these *were* the sons of Reuel son of Esau; duke Nahath, duke Zerah, duke Shammah, duke Mizzah: these *were* the dukes of Reuel in the land of Edom; these *were* the sons of Bashemath, wife of Esau.

18 And these *were* the sons of Aholibamah wife of Esau; duke Jeush, duke Jaalam, duke Korah: these *were* the dukes of Aholibamah, daughter of Anah, wife of Esau.

19 These *were* the sons of Esau, and these were their dukes, the same is Edom.

20 These *were* the sons of Seir the Horite;

the text informs us, that in conjunction with Reuben and Bilhah they attempted to put aside the priesthood as devolving on Joseph, to introduce the old dominion over church and state, which, as above, had been divided in the time of Peleg, and again confirmed by Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

This is not opinion only, we have scripture authority to conclude that this was the real state of the case; for after the genealogies of Esau and the Horites, which make a parenthesis of the whole of the 36th chapter, the 37th, which is then immediately connected with the 35th chapter, begins with the public acknowledgment of the priesthood of Joseph, as the next legal successor, he being the firstborn son of Rachel.

This will account for the expression in the 2d verse of chap. xxxvii. where Joseph is said to have been with the sons of Bilhah and Zilpah, viz. their firstborn sons, Dan and Gad, when he brought their evil report to his father. We are not informed what this evil report was; it has been thought that it was a report of their hatred to him, because Jacob is made to say in the common version, that he loved Joseph more than

all his children: but it appears plainly that this evil report was the attempt of these firstborn sons to cast out Joseph as the rightful heir to the priesthood. When Jacob was informed of this, it is said, ver. 3, ch. xxxvii. *he made him a coat of many colours*, Heb. *the garment of supplication*; and thus publicly declared him to be the legal successor.

Thus we are enabled to assign a sufficient reason why this view of the subject appears new. The priesthood of Jacob, and its passing to Joseph as the next firstborn, in whose line it was one hundred and eighty years in Egypt, till the establishment of the Levites, has not been known to translators and commentators; but which we have seen was the sole cause of the hatred of the brethren of Joseph, and the schism made by Reuben concerning Dan, the firstborn of Bilhah, in order to divide the government between them. See on ch. xxxvii. *And thus Reuben set aside the claim of Dan the son of Bilhah; or, "overthrew the bed of Bilhah,"* as above.

26. *Padan-aram*. Translated in the Greek *Μεσοποταμία*, Mesopotamia, from *μεσος*, the midst, and *ποταμός*, a river;

inhabitants of the land: Lotan and Shobal, and Zibeon and Anah.

21 And Dishon, and Ezer, and Dishan: these were dukes of the Horites, sons of Seir in the land of Edom.

22 Now the children of Lotan were, Hori and Heman: and the sister of Lotan, was Timna.

23 And the children of Shobal were these; Alvan and Manabath, and Ebal, Shepto and Onam.

24 Now these were the sons of Zibeon, even Ajah, and Anah: the same Anah that found the ancients in the wilderness, as he fed the fallow-deer, of Zibeon his father.

25 And these were the children of Anah, Dishon; and Aholibamah, the daughter of Anah.

26 And these were the children of Dishon: Hemdan and Heshban, and Ithran, and Cheran.

literally, *between the rivers*, the two rivers Euphrates and Tigris.

27. *Arta*, see ch. xxiii. 4. Afterwards Hebron, famous for electing David king seven years before he reigned in Jerusalem.

29. *Isaac gave up the ghost and died—old and full of days*, see on ch. xxv. 8. This is an unnecessary repetition. If he gave up the ghost, he died; if he were old, he must have been full of days.

NOTES ON CHAP. XXVI.

6. *And*. Eight times the conjunction copulative *and*, is made to occur in the vulgar version. Indeed the frequent occurrence of this conjunction in the English translation is a great defect, and often subverts the sense of the passage.

7. *They were strangers could not bear them*. Heb. of their sojourning could not support them.

24. *This was that Anah*. The words מַלְסָאֵת הַיַּעֲמִימִים *mal'sa'et ha-ye'emim*, are rendered *found the mules*. We cannot be led to suppose that the sacred scriptures are of so trifling a nature as it would appear if this were the true meaning of the writer. It could be of no consequence to posterity to be informed, that Anah found out the method of producing mules; surely the inspired penman has communicated something here of a more interesting nature.

Jerome renders the word יַעֲמִימִים *ye'emim*, by *hot waters*, but certainly without any authority; he says there are almost as many opinions as commentators. The Septuagint retain the Hebrew word; most of the Rabbies render it *mules*. Onkelos, by *giants*. Bochart argues very properly that the word is never used to mean *mules*, he thinks that the *Emims* were a great and powerful people. So far I am convinced that the learned Bochart is perfectly right, but we must endeavour to confirm this opinion from scripture, otherwise it remains opinion only. We find the *Emims* mentioned as a great and powerful people by Moses, Deut. ii. 10, *The Emims dwell there in times past, a people great, and many, and tall*. The word יַעֲמִימִים *Emim*, in this verse is the very same, both letters and vowels, as in Genesis. which is used by Moses to signify a people, and must necessarily have the same meaning and application there also, and not mules, as in the old translation.

27 The children of Ezer were these: Bilhan, and Zaavan, and Achan.

28 The children of Dishan were these, Uz and Aran.

29 These were the dukes of the Horites: duke Lotan, duke Shobal, duke Zibeon, duke Anah.

30 Duke Dishon, duke Ezer, duke Dishan: these were the dukes of Horites, by their dukedoms, in the land of Seir.

31 Now these were the kings, who reigned in the land of Edom: before a king reigned, over the sons of Israel.

32 When Bela the son of Beor, reigned in Edom: and the name of his city, was Dinhabah.

33 When Bela died: then Jobah the son of Zerah of Bozrah, reigned in his stead.

34 When Jobah died: then Husham of the land of Temani, reigned in his stead.

35 When Husham died: then Hadad the son

The word מִיִּמִּי *mi-mi* *la-cheamorim*, is rendered *asses*, but those people, who were princes, did not spend their time in doing that which this creature did, and continues to do without watching. This word in many places of scripture, is translated by *deer*, *fallow-deer*; creatures for the support of life, which required the superintendence of the owner to lead them to pasture, and to guard them from the attacks of wild beasts. It is introduced in immediate connection with *flocks*, *herds*, and *cattle*, Exod. xx. 17; Gen. xii. 16; I have therefore translated it as we find the same root translated Deut. xiv. 5; 1 Kings iv. 23.

This word then refers to a *great people*, who were found out by Anah as he travelled for pasturage in the wilderness. Not having met with any information among commentators respecting this people, I shall therefore endeavour to shew as far as we have any authority from scripture, and the plain meaning and application of the word, who we are to understand this ancient people to have been.

The word עֵמִים *Emim*, was applied by the sacred writers to mean a *great lapse of time*, a *long time*, *time of old*, 1 Chron. xvii. 10; *since the time*. This time here referred to was above 500 years before the time of David, Jud. xviii. 1; *In those days*, viz. at a very remote period, 200 years before the monarchy of Israel; Ezek. xxxviii. 7, *in old time*. I need not to multiply passages; these are sufficient to shew that this is the true meaning of the word עֵמִים *Emim*, which will authorize me to translate it accordingly.

Now as this is a plain reference to a *people of old time*, an *ancient race*; and as we have the genealogies of the patriarchs from Noah by Shem, these very *ancient people* could be no other than the descendants of Ham, who had, according to the prediction of Noah, taken up their abode in the land of Canaan, and had in the course of this long interval, 650 years, become a great people. I have before shewn that the descendants of Ham fixed their abode in Canaan, and established the idolatry of their progenitor; and here we are informed that Anah found the descendants of Ham, the idolatrous generation. The historian also gives us another piece of useful information, which was to be as an example to the Hebrews, and to all succeeding nations, viz. that God had punished them for their

of Bedad, who smote Midian in the country of Moab, reigned in his stead; and the name of his city was Avith.

36 When Hadad died: then Samlah, of Masrekah, reigned in his stead.

37 When Samlah died: then Saul of Rehoboth, of the river, reigned in his stead.

wickedness, in that he had destroyed their government, scattered the people, and had given their dominions into the hand of the Moabites, the descendants of Lot.

31. *These are the kings.* Both ancient and modern objectors have advanced very formidable arguments, in order to shew that Moses was not the writer. It has been said, "should any dateless writing be found wherein the writer should say, these things happened before the time of Henry the Eighth, it would be sufficient evidence that such writing could not have been written by any person who died before the time of Henry the Eighth." From which it is concluded, that the book of Genesis, so far from having been written by Moses, could not have been written till the time of Saul, or David, who were the first kings of Israel; and which was 500 years after the time of Moses.

This objection has done much injury to the religion of the Bible, and notwithstanding it has been passed over by Christians for ages, yet the arguments in support of it are so fallacious that it is surprising it should have remained unanswered to the present day.

There seems to be a degree of plausibility in what such writers have said, and we could easily admit the force of the application, did the text refer to the time of Saul, who is supposed by them to have been the first king of the Hebrews; for it does not refer to that period of their monarchy, but to the time of Moses. The historian gives the genealogy of the descendants of Esau, and we find that they at length became the kings of Edom. This took place during the time that the Hebrews were in Egypt; but at the Exodus, when they communicated with their brethren of Edom, they were acquainted with the changes which had taken place from their first settling in the country, which were committed to writing by the venerable penman. He then gives an account of their kings, eight in number, the descendants of Esau; who had reigned in Edom to that period, when a regular government was established among the Hebrews. Now it appears evident, that when they had established the government their governors were dignified with the title of king. In the book of Judges, during the interregnum, it is said, ch. xvii. 6, *In those days there was no king in Israel, but every man did that which was right in his own eyes*; this was nearly one hundred years before the time of Saul. If we go back from this interregnum, during which period six kings had reigned, it is said, ch. ix. 22, *when Abimelech had reigned three years over Israel*. Consequently this objection, that the book of Genesis could not be written before the time of Saul, because it has been erroneously supposed that he was the first king of Israel, falls to the ground.

The evidence that Moses was king, is equally as clear as that of the kings of Edom, or of Saul and David. We read that the chiefs of the people having assembled, Moses, with the assistance of Jethro prince of Midian, gave directions for forming a regular government. From this period he was acknowledged a king; for it is said in Deut. xxxiii. 5, *And he was king in Jeshurun, when the heads of the people, and the tribes were gathered together*. Here we see that

38 When Saul died: then Baal-hanan the son of Achbor, reigned in his stead.

39 When Baal-hanan, the son of Achbor died; then Hadar reigned in his stead; now the name of his city was Pau: and the name of his wife Mehetabel the daughter of Matred, the daughter of Mezahab.

Melek, king, was applied to Moses, as it was to all the kings of Israel. Beside, the text does not refer to any thing future, but to the kings who had reigned. Now it is plain that the line of Edomitish kings from Esau, who reigned during the time that the Hebrews were in Egypt, could only reach to his time. It appears that they were in Egypt 215 years. Esau settled among the Horites, and allowing him 50 years, before they obtained the government of the country, it leaves 165 years for the reign of eight kings to the time of Moses; allowing on the average 21 years to the reign of each king. That 21 years is the average reign of kings, may be clearly proved.

ENGLAND.—If we examine the chronology of the kings of England from William, who began to reign in 1066, to George the Second, 1763, and divide the interval, 694 by 33, the number that reigned, it leaves 21 years for the average reign of each king.

SCOTLAND.—From Goran, A.D. 501, to the end of the reign of James the sixth, 1600, interval 1099, number of reigns 56, the average reign is 20 years.

FRANCE.—From Charles the Great, A.D. 814, to Lewis the Fourteenth, 1715, interval 901, number of reigns 43, it leaves 20 years for the average reign of each king.

GERMANY.—From Arnolph, A.D. 888, to the time of Rodolph of Habsburgh, who was the first of the Austrian family, 1293, interval 403, number of reigns 19, the average reign is 21 years.

From Rodolphus, A.D. 1293, to Joseph, 1711, interval 420, number of reigns 21, average reign 20 years.

SPAIN.—From Pelagius, A.D. 735, to Charles the Second, 1700, interval 965, number of reigns 49, average reign 20 years.

PORTUGAL.—From John Duke of Braganza, A.D. 1640, to Joseph, 1753, interval 113, number of reigns 5, average reign 22 years.

POLAND.—From Boleslaus, A.D. 999, to Augustus, 1753, interval 754, number of reigns 35, average reign 21 years.

DENMARK.—From Gotricus, A.D. 801, to Frederick, 1731, interval 930, number of reigns 46, average reign 21 years.

SWEDEN.—From Hero, A.D. 834, to Frederick, 1753, interval 919, number of reigns 47, average reign 20 years.

ASSYRIA.—From Phul, B.C. 777 years, to the end of the reign of Sardanapohus, B.C. 605, interval 171, number of reigns 8, average reign 21 years.

PERSIA.—From Cyrus, B.C. 559 years, to the conquest of Persia by Alexander, B.C. 331, interval 228, number of reigns 11, average reign 21 years.

EGYPT.—From Osorthon, B.C. 800 years, in the 24th of Rehobotham the second, to the end of the reign of Psammetichus, 6 years after the death of Darius the Mede, B.C. 324, interval 276 years, number of reigns 14, average reign 20 years.

EGYPT.—From Ptolemy, B.C. 322 years, to the end of the reign of Cleopatra, B.C. 31 years, interval 292 years, number of reigns 13, average reign 22 years.

40 But these were the names of the dukes of Esau, according to their families; and their districts after their names: duke Timnah, duke Alvah, duke Jetheth.

41 Duke Ahdebarah, duke Elah, duke Pinon.

42 Duke Kenaz, duke Teman, duke Mibzar.

43 Duke Magdiel, duke Iram: these were dukes of Edom, according to their habitations in the land of their possession; the same Esau was, the father of Edom.

JUDAH.—From David, B. C. 1055 years, to Zedekiah, B. C. 587, interval 468, number of reigns 21, average reign 22 years.

It cannot then be supposed that a writer living 500 years after Moses, and writing this account, as objectors say, should stop here and not continue the line of the kings of Edom to the time of Saul; for if we are to understand that the eight kings of Edom are to reach from the establishment of the monarchy in the line of Edom to the time of Saul, a period of 700 years, and take the average, each king would have reigned about 90 years. Therefore as the reign of the last of these eight kings of Edom was in the time of Moses,—as kings reigned over the Hebrews from the time of Moses,—it is evident that both the ancient and modern objectors have been altogether mistaken as to the time and person of the first king of the Hebrews. Consequently all the historical and chronological evidence which they have in all ages, since the dispersion of the Jews, brought forward to prove that Moses was not the writer of the book of Genesis, only proves their profound ignorance of the history and chronology of the Bible.

33. *And Jobab the son of Zerah of Bosrah reigned.* It has long been supposed by commentators, that the writer of the book of Job did not introduce a real character, but that it was the production of inventive genius. By a due examination of the genealogy, we shall find that Jobab in Genesis, and Job in the book of Job, are the same. The sacred writer has written the name in Genesis with an additional *beth*, but it is customary in Hebrew to double the letter; as *דב* *dob*, to tremble, *דבב* *dobab*, to tremble exceedingly; *בב* *bar*, to secrete, *בבב* *barar*, to secrete entirely.

It is of importance that this matter should be ascertained, for objectors have said, that "chronologists have been at a loss where to place and how to dispose of the book of Job, as it contains no one historical circumstance, or allusion to any, so as to serve to determine its place in the Bible."

This however is an error, for it is said that he lived in the land of Uz. By turning to the 21st verse of this chapter we find that Uz was the son of Dishon, of Seir in the land of Edom, which was in the neighbourhood of the Chaldeans: this was the land that received its name from Uz the son of Dishon, and was to a certainty the land where Job reigned. But what will still render this more clear, viz. that there was a land of Uz where the descendants of Esau or Edom dwelt, is Lam. iv. 21, *O daughter of Edom, that dwellest in the land of Uz.*

The names of the friends of Job were, Bildad the Shunite, Zophar the Naamathite, Elihu the Buzite, and Eliphaz the Temanite. The land where Bildad dwelt had its name from Shuah, a son of Abraham by Keturah; Zophar was of Naamah, which lay on the coast of Edom. The time of Elihu is also ascertained as follows: in the history it is said that Milcah had

NOW Jacob dwelt in the land of the sojournings of his father, in the land of Canaan.

2 These were the generations of Jacob, Joseph being seventeen years old, was feeding the flock with his brethren; where the youth was with the sons of Bilhah, and with the sons of Zilpah, the wives of his father: and Joseph brought their evil murmurings, to their father.

born to Nahor a son whose name was Buz, who was the father of the Buzites, and Elihu was the son of Barachel the Buzite, who was, as the Chaldee paraphrast reads, "of the kindred of Abram;" consequently, Elihu the Buzite was of a much later date than Abraham.

The last is Eliphaz the Temanite, or of the land of Teman, Esau's firstborn son by his wife Adah; ver. 10. Esau also had another son called Reuel, who was the father of Zerah, ver. 13, who was the father of Jobab; and it is said, ver. 33, *Jobab the son of Zerah reigned.* So that Eliphaz of the land of Teman was Eliphaz the Temanite in Job; and as he was uncle to Zerah the father of Job, he says to Job, ch. xv. 10, *With us are the greyheaded and very aged men, much elder than thy father.* This evidently shews that the book of Job refers for time to the third generation from Esau; or, agreeably to the Septuagint, to the fifth from Abraham. The descent stands thus; Abraham, Isaac, Esau, Reuel, Zerah, Jobab or Job: but from the promised line, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Levi, Kohath, Amram, Moses. So that when Moses fled from the face of Pharaoh to Idumea, or Arabia; Jobab or Job, his kinsman, was the reigning king of that country. Thus we find that there are historical references which determine the time of the book of Job. Here to a certainty we find the man, and the time when he lived; that he descended from Abraham by the line of Esau; that he was the king of Idumea, or Edom; and contemporary with the Hebrew legislator, who was of the line of Jacob.

NOTES ON CHAP. XXXVII.

2. *Their evil report.* It does not appear in this verse what this evil report was, but the third verse will enable us to understand what is called the evil report.

3. *More than all his children.* The next inquiry is concerning the translation of this clause; there can be no hesitation in declaring that it is wrong. The word *כא* *kaal*, rendered by *all*, has the *mem* prefixed, which the translators have rendered by *more than*. But it cannot be so translated. It is not a compound word, but a simple preposition, translated in other parts of scripture by *before*; see Num. xxxii. 22; Isa. xliii. 13; Jud. viii. 13; Prov. viii. 22; which then reads, *before any*.

Because he was the son of his old age. Neither can this translation be admitted, because Benjamin had a prior right on this ground, as being the youngest son. The word *זקנים* *zekanim*, is translated *old age*, but it cannot have this meaning and application; there is no pronoun possessive in this word, except it be taken from the very last word in the sentence, which would be a violation of all rule; but which the translators have done from the word *לו* *lo*, and they have also rejected the *ל* *lamed*, which reads, *after him*.

זקנים *Zekanim* is a noun plural, and means *elders* in all the scripture, when truly translated; see Exod. xxiv. 14; Num.

3 Now Israel preferred Joseph, before any of his children, for a successor of elders after him: and he made for him, a garment of supplication.

4 Then his brethren saw that their father loved him more than any of his brethren; and they hated him: for they could not speak to him in peace.

xi. 25; Deut. xxii. 26;—xxv. 7, &c. &c. At this period, as before observed, Jacob prepared Joseph to succeed the *zekanin*, or elders; for this was the term given to those who were at the head of the priesthood: therefore *בן זקנים* *ben zekanim* does not mean a son of his old age, but with the true translation of *בן לו*, i. e. after him, it reads, a son or successor of elders. The clause truly reads, For a successor of elders after him.

A coat of many colours. Commentators in general have altogether misunderstood the meaning of this passage. Some have supposed that Jacob was partial to Joseph because he was the son of his old age, by attending more to him than to his brethren, and have called it "foolish parental fondness." Such writers have been too hasty in their conclusions: we shall find, that though he at this period of Joseph's life was more particularly careful in watching over him because of his inexperience, this was not the cause of the envy of his brethren. Where should we look for the sanctity of this part of scripture, if it consisted only of a better coat being given to Joseph, than to his brethren?

The first error in all the vulgar versions, appears to have arisen from the improper translation of *אהב* *ahab*, which is rendered *loved*. Without any attention to a variation according to idiom, which then requires a different form of expression; the translators and revisers have only varied it by two modes of expression, viz. *love* and *friendship*. Hence many injudicious commentators have endeavoured to shew how wrong it was for Jacob to indulge this fondness for Joseph above the rest of his brethren: when no such thing is signified in the original.

This word, like all others, has various forms for application, according to the affection and intention of the speaker, all partaking of the same radical meaning: as *love*, *esteem*, *kindness*, *fondness*, *regard*, *respect*, and so to *prefer*, in consequence. We have sufficient authority to say, that Jacob did not love Joseph more than all his sons; for during the famine such was his affection for his youngest son Benjamin, that though their families were on the point of starving for bread, he refused to send him with his brethren to Egypt, ch. xlii. 38; which is sufficient evidence to prove that Jacob did not love Joseph more than all his children.

This verse refers to the time when Jacob preferred Joseph to the priesthood, not because he loved him more than all his sons, but because he was the next legal heir, the next legitimate firstborn, who, according to the divine law, succeeded on the defection of Reuben.

The words *כסות רובו* *kathoneth phasim*, translated a coat of many colours, signify a peculiar garment worn by the priests. Such were the garments worn by Aaron and his sons, Exod. xxviii. 4, and a bordered coat; ver. 39, 40;—xxix. 5;—xl. 39, 40, and thou shalt put upon Aaron the holy garments—and thou shalt bring his sons, and clothe them with, *כסות* *kuthanoth* coats; Lev. viii. 13;—ix. 5, and carried them in their coats, viz. the garments of the priests, in which they had been offering strange fire before the Lord; Ezra ii. 69, and one hundred priests' garments; Neh. vii. 70, 72.

5 Moreover Joseph dreamed a dream, which he told to his brethren: and they continued henceforth to hate him.

6 Again he said to them: Hear ye now this dream, which I have dreamed.

7 Now behold, we were binding sheaves in the midst of the field; when lo, my sheaf arose,

The word *כסות* *phasim*, has been supposed to come from *בס פהס*, or *בפס פהס*, to diminish, to fail. But this can possibly give neither meaning nor application to the passage; neither are we authorised to give rendering in any part of scripture. Had Joseph had a coat of many colours, it would have made him the sport of the people of the country; and not the envy of his brethren. But we find the same words *kathoneth phasim* applied to the daughters of kings; therefore this question may be asked; If this garment were a peculiar garment worn by those who were called to the sacred office of the priesthood, how comes it, or something resembling it, to have been worn by the daughters of kings? In answer to which I say, that it was then the custom for the royal family to wear a garment by which they were known, as it is at this day, in some of the eastern nations; and as the patriarchal king and the judges of Israel were also priests, we find they wore something that corresponded to the high office. When the woman of Endor described Samuel as wearing a mantle, Saul knew that he was Samuel. Now though this dress which was worn by the daughters of the reigning king, is said to be the *kathoneth phasim*, or the garment of supplication, it does not follow that it was the mantle of the successor to the priestly office; yet it appears that something of the kind was attached to the whole family of the monarchs in the times of the kings of the Hebrews. Thus we see that it points out, in this representative church, the union of the kingly and priestly offices in the person of the true Messiah, who was to be a king and a priest for ever.

The word *כסות* *phasim*, rendered many colours, is of Chaldean origin; it is derived from *בס פהס* *phayas*, to appease, supplicate, request; see *Lingua Sacra*, rad. *בס פהס* *phayas*, and David appeased his men; Targ. Jona. 1 Sam. xxiv. 8, and she supplicated; Targ. Jerus. Esth. viii. 3, neither will he be appeased; Targ. Jerus. Prov. vi. 38; and the noun *בס פהס* *phasim*, reconciliation, satisfaction. The passage then reads, and he made him a vesture of supplication, or the vesture of the priesthood. Hence it appears that the true translation of this passage is of considerable importance; it not only adds great dignity to the priestly office, by shewing that the priests were set apart from the most ancient time to be prepared for, and to fill the office by divine appointment; but it makes the text perfectly consistent with the Hebrew, and with the history concerning the priesthood of Joseph.

I have been particular in referring to the above passages, to satisfy the reader concerning the real cause of the hatred which the brethren of Joseph had toward him, and which could only be done by ascertaining the nature and use of the *כסות* *kathoneth*, or vesture of the priesthood worn by Joseph. Thus we find that the scripture is the best interpreter of scripture, for in all the comments I have seen, I could not gather any information how the order of the priesthood was filled after the rejection of Reuben, whose right it was by birth, for they worshipped God in Egypt; see 1 Sam. ii. 27, Thus saith the Lord, Did I plainly appear unto the house of thy father, when they

and also stood: then behold, around it, your sheaves; and they bowed themselves before my sheaf.

8 Then his brethren said to him; What, ruling shalt thou reign over us? no dominion shalt thou exercise, over us: so they combined still hating him; because of his dreams, and because of his words.

9 Moreover again he dreamed, another dream; then he told it to his brethren: and he said, Behold, I have dreamed a dream again; when lo, the sun and the moon, and eleven stars, bowed before me.

10 Which he told to his father, and to his brethren; then his father reproved him, and he said to him; For what cause is this dream, that thou hast dreamed? Shall I with thy mother and thy brethren approaching come, to bow ourselves before thee to the earth?

11 And his brethren envied him: but his father regarded the word.

12 Now his brethren went to feed the flock of their father, in Shechem.

were in Egypt, in the house of Pharaoh? And it was a hundred and eighty years before the Levites were chosen to the ministry; see on Exod. xxxiii. 22. Now after the rejection of Reuben; the next firstborn took the excellency, and Joseph as the firstborn of Rachel succeeded to the priesthood, 1 Chron. v. 1, 2.

Thus we see that the *kathoneth* was the common garment of the priesthood, which his father put on him, it being now the time of his preparation for the office. Therefore the brethren of Joseph appear to have taken up the cause of Reuben as the injured party, for this had laid the foundation for their hatred to him. This character was peculiar to him in Egypt, where his communications were so striking, that Pharaoh said, *This is a man in whom is the spirit of God*, and by virtue of his office he said to his brethren, *Wot ye not that such a man as I can certainly divine?*

8. *Shalt thou indeed reign over us?* The words *תִּשְׁלַח תִּשְׁלַח* *ha maaloch timloch*, are rendered in the common version, *shalt thou indeed reign*. Whereas the first word, *ha maaloch*, which is rendered *indeed*, literally means *to rule*; it is the participle ruling. And the word *timloch* is the second person future of reign, Jer. xxii. 15; Ezek. xl. 13; Exod. xv. 10; 1 Sam. viii. 9, 11;—xi. 12, &c.

Or shalt thou indeed have dominion over us? It must appear evident, that the same question could not be asked twice in that book which is in the original the most perfect as to accuracy in language of any that ever was, or that ever will be written; otherwise it would not be worthy of being called the word of God. To have dominion over a people, and to reign over a people, are the same. Now as it is obvious that a negative is implied in the interrogative part of this verse, therefore this word *im*, or, should have been rendered *negatively*, as it is in Gen. xlii. 15; 1 Sam. xiv. 45; 2 Sam. xi. 11; 1 Kings xvii. 12; 2 Kings ii. 2.

13 And Israel said to Joseph, Perhaps thy brethren feed in Shechem; go, for I will send thee to them: and he said to him, Here am I.

14 Then he said to him, Go now, consider the peace of thy brethren, and the welfare of the flock; then bring me word: so he sent him from the vale of Hebron, and he went to Shechem.

15 And a man found him, behold, wandering in the field: and the man asked him saying, What seekest thou?

16 And he replied, I seek my brethren: inform me I pray thee, where they are feeding.

17 Then the man answered, They departed hence, truly I heard them say; We will go to Dothan: so Joseph went after his brethren, and found them, in Dothan.

18 Now they saw him afar off: and when he drew near to them, thus they conspired against him, to cause his death.

19 For they said, each one to his brethren: Behold this lord of the dreams, cometh.

20 And now, come ye, for we will slay him,

The words *מַשְׁחָל תִּשְׁחָל* *maashol timshol*, are in the common version rendered, *shalt thou indeed have dominion?* *Maashol* signifies *rule, dominion*, not *indeed*, as in the common version; see Ezek. xix. 14. And *timshol* is the second person singular future of the verb. Agreeably to idiom, the clause will be truly rendered, *no dominion shalt thou exercise over us*.

9. Whatever may be the astronomical allusion to the eleven stars, it is plain that Joseph is here shewn by the sun and moon, that his father and mother were *to bow or humble themselves* before him, or rather that they were to be beneath him as to elevation in life; for in the figurative language of the East, the sun and moon always meant the principals of a nation and the heads of families: so it was understood by Jacob in the following verse. But the *eleven stars* seem to have puzzled most commentators; they however meant, in the first place, his eleven brethren; and by applying eleven stars to them, it is reasonable to conclude, as the Egyptians and Hebrews were a scientific people, that by these he meant the eleven signs of the zodiac, the zodiac being the path of the sun and moon, as applicable to his brethren.

20. *Into some pit.* The word *חֲבֹרוֹת* *haberoth* is rendered as a noun singular; it is plural, and should be rendered *pits*; and *אֶחָד* *achad*, which means *one*, with the *ב* *beth* prefixed, reads *into one of the pits*.

21. *Let us not kill him.* Heb. *וְלֹא נִשְׁחָת נַפְשׁוֹ* *naaphesh*, means his animal soul.

That was on him. It is before said that they stript Joseph out of his coat, therefore there was no necessity for the translators to say *that it was on him*. There is no authority for this rendering in the Hebrew, and besides, we lose important information. The word *גִּלְגָּל* *gnalo*, is of very extensive application; it means that which belongeth to a person, either as to his private or public character, viz. *for him—unto him*. With the pronoun of the second person, it is rendered in Ezra x. 4,

then we will cast him, into one of the pits; and say, An evil beast hath devoured him: then we shall see what will become of his dreams.

21 When Reuben heard, then he delivered him, from their hand: for he said, We will not smite his soul.

22 Moreover Reuben had said to them, Ye shall not shed blood; cast him into the pit, which is in the wilderness; but ye shall not put forth a hand against him: that he might afterward deliver him out of their hand, to restore him to his father.

23 Now it was when Joseph came, to his brethren, that they stripped Joseph of his coat, the coat of supplication, which belonged him.

24 Then they took him, and cast him into the pit: but the pit was miry; no water was therein.

25 Now they tarried to eat bread; then they raised their eyes and looked, when behold, a company of Ishmaelites, came from Gilead; with their camels bearing spicery, even balm and myrrh; going down to Egypt.

26 Then Judah said, to his brethren: What profit, if we slay our brother, and conceal his blood?

27 Come ye, and we will sell him to the Ish-

belongeth thee. From what has been said on this subject, ver. 3, the reader will see that here is a declaration concerning the order of the priesthood, that on the defection of Reuben it belonged to him.

23. *This pit that is in the wilderness.* There was no necessity to say that this pit was in the wilderness, for the words *this pit* point out where the pit was. The words *min van habar hazeh*, i. e. *that pit*, refer to another pit in the wilderness, one having been mentioned in the 20th verse. This pit was recommended by Reuben, no doubt, as less dangerous, that he might deliver him.

23. *Strip Joseph out of his coat.* A very improper mode of expression; his coat of many colours; see on ver. 3.

24. *And the pit was empty, there was no water in it.* I need not inform the reader that this must necessarily be an erroneous translation; for if the pit were empty, there certainly could be no water in it. This error has arisen from the improper translation of *pr reek*, which is rendered empty; it means *marshy* or *fenny* places, properly the thick mire of a pit or well, when the water is exhausted; see Psa. xviii. 42, where the word conveys this meaning, *I did cast them out as the dirt (mire) in the streets.* Also in Rabbinical and Talmud Hebrew, it means a *fen* or *marsh*, see Chull. fol. 27, 1; and Jarchi on Gen. ii. The passage will then read consistently, viz. *But the pit was miry; no water was therein.*

29. *And he rent his clothes.* Many have been the conjectures respecting this mode of expressing the most poignant grief of mind. It was a very ancient custom, and was continued to the end of the Jewish monarchy. The high priest

maelites, so our hand shall not be upon him; for our brother is our flesh: and his brethren bearkened.

28 Now the merchant-men of Midian passed, as they had drawn and raised Joseph from the pit; so they sold Joseph to the Ishmaelites, for twenty pieces of silver: and they brought Joseph into Egypt.

29 When Reuben returned to the pit, then behold, Joseph was not in the pit; and he rent his clothes.

30 And he returned to his brethren, and said: The youth is not; and I, whither shall I go?

31 Then they took the coat of Joseph, and killed a kid of the goats; and they dipped the coat in the blood.

32 Moreover they sent the coat of supplication, also they came to their father; and said, This have we found: discern now, whether it be the coat of thy son, or not.

33 And he knew it, then he said, The coat of my son; an evil beast hath devoured him: torn, torn is Joseph.

34 Then Jacob rent his garments, and put sackcloth on his loins: thus he mourned for his son many days.

35 Now all his sons, and all his daughters,

rent his clothes, Matt. xxvi. 63; Josephus, De Bell. Jud. c. 13, § 2, says, "The high-priests and the chief men being filled with concern, rent their garments." And Maimonides, "When witnesses speak out the blasphemy which they heard, then all hearing the blasphemy are bound to rend their clothes." The true meaning and application are explained by Jod, ch. ii. 31, *Rend your heart and not your garments, and turn unto the Lord your God.*

Many commentators have thought it strange that Reuben should have expressed surprise before his brethren, when he did not find Joseph in the pit; and that he should so readily have joined his brethren in the contrivance to deceive his father. But Reuben appears to have left the pit, and to have removed to a considerable distance, the better to elude the observation of his brethren, that he might deliver Joseph and restore him to his father, ver. 22. Now when he found that he was not in the pit, it was natural for him to conclude that he was devoured by some reptiles in the pit. This also appears to be the case when he came to his brethren, for they concealed the fact from him, the more easily to induce him to join in their plan of deceiving Jacob; then as the only way to clear them all, he consented to dip the coat in the blood of the kid, and to send it to their father. But the proof that Reuben was ignorant concerning the fate of Joseph is to be found in ch. xlii. 21, when his brethren came before him, and he detained one of them till they brought their youngest brother. Conviction seized their souls, all except Reuben, and they said, one to another, *We are verily guilty concerning our brother, in that we saw the anguish of his soul, when he*

rose to comfort him, but he refused to be comforted; moreover he said, Surely I will descend to my son, mourning to the grave: thus his father wept for him.

36 So the Midianites sold him, in Egypt: to Potiphar, an officer of Pharaoh; a captain of the guard.

CHAP. XXXVIII.

¶ **N**OW it was at that time, when Judah went down from his brethren: and he turned to a certain Adullamite, and his name was Hirah.

2 Now Judah saw there a daughter of a Canaanite, and his name was Shuah: and he took her, and went with her.

3 Then she conceived, and bare a son; and he called his name, Er.

4 Also she conceived again, and bare a son; and she called his name, Onan.

besought us, and we would not hear: therefore is this distress come upon us. Then the character of Reuben appeared; he broke forth upon them saying, *Spake I not unto you, saying, Ye shall not sin against the youth, and ye would not hear? therefore behold, also his blood is required.* Such was the effect of this solemn charge, that they, still believing Reuben to have a divine right to the priesthood, were silent; he informed them that the divine command given to Noah, viz. *whose sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed*, had been disobeyed by them, that the blood of Joseph was required; and such was the effect of this natural and honourable feeling, this language of pure natural affection, that Joseph turned himself about from them and wept.

NOTES ON CHAP. XXXVIII.

5. *He was at Chezib.* This word appears to be applied originally to the people. It was proper to give a description of the people among whom he had formed an alliance. It literally means *the idolaters*, the *LIARS*, which is its primary meaning; *deceivers*, *lying diviners*, a term or phrase given to a peculiar sect of the idolaters who had gone out of the orthodox way of the idol worshippers, and therefore called *חזאים* *chazaim*, i.e. *deceitful—liars*, Prov. xxi. 28;—vi. 19; Jud. xvi. 20.

8. *And Onan knew.* I do not know that I have met with any part of scripture more unwisely translated than this. Such a sense, however, is not to be found in the original Hebrew; it is chargeable on those only who have thus so incorrectly translated the passage.

It must appear evident to the reader, on reflection, that had the sacred writer meant to convey such an indelicate sense as is given in the common version, there then had not been any necessity whatever for him, when he had mentioned the circumstance, to have repeated it by the words *lest that he should give seed to his brother*; because the very pointed manner of its being so mentioned, rendered any further remark or explanation altogether unnecessary in the same sentence. Such repetitions are not to be met with in the Hebrew scriptures.

5 Moreover she conceived again, and bare a son; and she called his name Shelah: now he was at Chezib, when she bare him.

6 Then Judah took a wife, for Er his first-born, whose name was Tamar.

7 Now Er the first-born of Judah, was wicked in the sight of JEHOVAH: and JEHOVAH caused him to die.

8 Then Judah said to Onan; Go to the wife of thy brother, and marry her, and raise posterity to thy brother.

9 But Onan knew, that the posterity was not for him; so it was, when he went to the wife of his brother, who corrupted the land; that he gave not posterity to his brother.

10 Also he committed evil in the sight of JEHOVAH: therefore he died, also before him.

11 Then Judah said to Tamar his daughter-in-law, Remain a widow in the house of thy father, till Shelah my son be grown; for he

The word *רמא* *shicheeth*, which is so improperly translated, is only thus translated in this passage; in every other part of scripture where it occurs, it is rendered agreeably to its true meaning, to *corrupt*, to *destroy*; but it does not embrace the meaning given in the common version of this passage. See where the same word with the same vowels is thus properly translated, Exod. xxxii. 7, *corrupted*; Deut. ix. 12;—xxxii. 5; Jer. xlviii. 18; Lam. ii. 5, 6; Amos, i. 11, and *corrupted*.

There is neither authority nor necessity for the neuter pronoun *it*, or the word *or*; both these words are supplied to make sense, which shows that the common translation is improper. The error arises through the mistranslation and application of the word *רמא* *ve shicheeth*, and by the translators having made a separate proposition where there is no authority for it in Hebrew.

This word *רמא* *shicheeth*, literally reads *for he corrupted*; that is, by his bad example *he corrupted the land*: for it is said that he as well as Er *was wicked in the sight of the Lord*.

The whole clause, which is one proposition only, as is signified by the stop *Katon*, which is upon the word *רמא* *artsah*, *the land*, and not two propositions, as in the common version, reads thus: *So it was when he had been to the wife of his brother, that he corrupted the custom of the land.* It then follows: *in not giving posterity to his brother.*

Thus it appears what the nature of the wickedness of Onan was; for as well as refusing to fulfil the law respecting the widow, *he was wicked in the sight of the Lord*; a phrase applied to those who endeavoured to overturn the divine order by sacrifice, thus termed *in the sight of the Lord*: because the worship by sacrifice; and the communication from the Cherubim, were to be more immediately in the sight or presence of God. Therefore his crime appears to have been an active and diligent practice, for so the word *רמא* *shicheeth* signifies, in *corrupting* and overturning the true worship which God had established by Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and substituting in its stead the sensual abominations consequent on idolatry; for which reason it is said, *he was wicked in the sight of the Lord*.

10. *And the thing which he did displeased, &c.* There is not

thought, Surely he will die also, like his brethren: so Tamar went; and dwelt at the house of her father.

12 After many days, the daughter of Shuah the wife of Judah died: and Judah was consoled, when he went to the shearers of his sheep, he and Hirah, his neighbour the Adullamite, to Timnah.

13 Now it was told to Tamar, saying: Behold thy father-in-law goeth to Timnah, to shear his sheep.

14 Then she put the garments of her widowhood from off her, and covered herself with a veil, thus she wrapped herself; then she sat in the gate of the fountains, which is by the way of Timnath: for she saw that Shelah was grown, and she was not given to him for a wife.

15 When Judah saw her; for he considered her as a harlot: because she covered her face;

16 Then he turned to her by the way, and said, Go I pray thee, I will come to thee; for he knew not his daughter-in-law: but she said, What wilt thou give to me, if thou comest to me?

17 And he said, I will send a kid of the goats, from the flock: then she said, Surely thou wilt give a pledge till thou send.

18 Moreover he said, What pledge shall I give to thee? and she answered, Thy signet, thy bracelets, also thy staff that is in thy hand:

any authority for the words *the thing*, in the common version; *וְיָמָא יָעֵרָא*, which is rendered *displeased*, literally means *evil*, and *וְיָמָא בִּגְדֵנֶהָ*, which means *the eyes*, or *sight*, is omitted. This proposition reads truly, *Thus he committed that evil in the sight of Jehovah*, viz. the same evil that Er his brother had committed, which was setting up idolatry, the idolatry of these Canaanites, who were his brethren by his mother; and which appears to have been carried to the same excess by Onan, as to have been done in the presence, in the sight of *Jehovah*; that is, in the sanctuary appropriated to the worship of God, signified here by the *sight of Jehovah*.

Therefore Er and Onan were punished for the same sort of crimes; they were brought up in the idolatry of their mother and her people, and notwithstanding they were obliged to obey the command of Judah in taking Tamar, he being a judge, and invested with authority as a judge, to punish for disobedience, ver. 24th, yet they refused to comply with the law in raising posterity. This, I say, appears to have been one of the crimes of Er; he is the first mentioned as being *wicked in the sight of the Lord*; which, as above, has a reference to his introducing the Chazibian idolatry in the presence of the Lord, viz. in the tabernacles where God was worshipped agreeably to the rites and ceremonies as taught by Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. The remark made by Judah concerning Shelah, shews that Shelah was of the same profession as his brethren, and that Onan

which he gave to her, so he came to her, and she conceived by him.

19 Then she arose and departed, but she laid aside her veil from her; and she put on the garments of her widowhood.

20 Now Judah sent a kid of the goats, by the hand of his neighbour the Adullamite, to receive his pledge from the hand of the woman: but he found her not.

21 Then he asked the men of the place saying; Where is the public female of the fountains, in the way? and they said; There was no public female.

22 So he returned to Judah, and he said, I found her not: yea even the men of the place said; There was no public female.

23 Then Judah said, She shall take it to herself, because we shall be despised: behold I sent this kid, but thou hast not found her.

24 Now it was in about three months, that it was told to Judah saying, Tamar thy daughter-in-law is a harlot; and also behold, she is pregnant by fornication: then Judah said; Bring her forth, for she shall be burnt.

25 When she came forth, she sent to her father-in-law, saying; By the man to whom these belong, I am pregnant: then she said, Discern I pray thee, to whom these, the signet, the bracelets, and the staff, belong.

26 Then Judah acknowledged, for he said,

committed the same crimes as Er, viz. *Lest peradventure he also die as his brethren did*. This is also the opinion of the most learned Rabbies, who infer from the expression *וְיָמָא כְּאֶרְוֹתָם*, *also him*, that they both died for a similar crime.

11. It must appear to be an incongruous expression for Judah to say, *Till Shelah my son be grown, for he said, Lest peradventure he die also as his brethren did*. For it must appear, that as his brethren died by the hand of God, the circumstance of Shelah being grown, or not grown, could not have secured him from experiencing a similar visitation for the same crime. The narrative itself assigns a reason why he did not give his son to Tamar; he was afraid that Shelah would meet with the same fate, for when he was grown he did not give him to her. The word *וְיָמָא אָמַר*, rendered *he said*, should be rendered as it is in 1 Sam. xx. 26, *he thought*. And *וְיָמָא*, rendered by *lest*, should be translated, as in other parts of scripture, by *surely*; see on ch. iii. 23, where I have shewn that *וְיָמָא* has this signification. Thus by the true translation we avoid the incongruous expression; and we learn that Judah did not intend to give his third son to Tamar, and this was understood by her, which was the reason why she acted as she did, believing it to be her duty according to the express letter of the law, that the next akin should raise posterity to his deceased relative. There can be no doubt of Shelah having adopted the religious profession of his mother,

She is justified before me, because I gave her not to Shelah my son: but he acknowledged her not again.

27 Now it was at the time of her bringing forth, for behold twins, were in her womb;

28 Yea it was in her bringing forth, that *the one* gave a hand: then the midwife took, and bound upon his hand a scarlet thread, saying, This came forth first.

29 So it was, as he drew back his hand, then behold his brother came forth; so she said, How hast thou broken forth? upon thee is the breach: and he called his name, Pharez.

30 Then afterwards his brother came forth, who had upon his hand the scarlet thread: and he called his name, Zarah.

CHAP. XXXIX.

¶ **N**OW Joseph was brought to Egypt, and Potiphar the chamberlain of Pharaoh, captain of the guard, an Egyptian, bought him, at the hand of the Ishmaelites, who brought him there.

2 But **JEHOVAH** was with Joseph; for he was a

among the Chezibian idolaters, and therefore, as his brethren had corrupted the land by endeavouring to establish this abominable idolatry in the tabernacles of God, and would not conform to the law, to raise posterity, Judah was afraid of his meeting with the same death.

26. Tamar was no doubt a virtuous woman; Judah had promised to give her his son, but omitting to do so, she made use of this stratagem. It shews that she was desirous, as all the chaste Hebrew women were, of having children, in expectation of the accomplishment of the ancient promise concerning the coming of Messiah. Consistently with the law the relative of the deceased was to marry the widow, and conscientious women strictly abided by the letter of the law. Judah in this matter was the sinner, as he acknowledges, ver. 26, for he knowingly omitted giving his son to her, ver. 10; he said, *lest peradventure he die also like his brethren*. Therefore she put herself in the way of Judah, who had just buried his wife. From which it appears, that though she put on a different character, it was with a design to induce Judah, who was then the next akin, to marry her, agreeably to the law of the nation. That this was her truly conscientious motive, and not lewdness, is evident, otherwise she would not have laid wait for the father of Shelah; she immediately put off her veil, and the garments of the *zonah*, harlot. This was plainly the understanding of the sacred writer, for he says, ver. 15, *when Judah saw her, he thought her to be a zonah*, harlot; but knowing this was not the case, when the friend of Judah was sent to give her the reward, he uses the word *kedeshah*, to sanctify, consecrate, or set apart. In the old version it is rendered improperly *harlot*; but Moses, who copied the account of this circumstance from the records which had come down to him, knowing that she had acted consistently with the law and the ancient usage of the church, does

prosperous man: and he was in the house of his lord, the Egyptian.

3 When his lord saw, that **JEHOVAH** was with him, and all that he did, **JEHOVAH** prospered in his hand.

4 (For Joseph found favour in his sight, because he served him: for he made him overseer of his house, and besides all he had, he gave into his hand.)

5 Then it was, when he had made him overseer in his house, and over all that he had; that **JEHOVAH** blessed the house of the Egyptian, because of Joseph: for the blessing of **JEHOVAH** was upon all that he had, in the house, and in the field.

6 Thus he left all his substance in the hand of Joseph, for he knew not without him, what he had; except the bread that he was eating: now Joseph was of a comely form, and of a beautiful aspect.

7 Moreover it was after these things, that the wife of his lord cast her eyes on Joseph: and she said, Lie with me.

8 But he refused, and said to the wife of his

not say that the messenger inquired for the *zonah*, harlot, but for the *kedeshah*, the consecrated female. Thus we see how commentators have erred who have given an opinion contrary to the obvious meaning of the writer, and that those who have used an illiberal freedom of speech respecting the conduct of Tamar, have been ignorant respecting the laws and customs of this ancient people.

She hath been more righteous than I. This translation supposes that Judah considered it right in some degree, which cannot be allowed; *tsaddikah*, literally reads, *she is justified*: and *mimeni*, which is rendered, *than I*, reads *before me*, viz. *she is justified before me*.

NOTES ON CHAP. XXXIX.

4. *And his master saw that the Lord was with him.* The word which is here rendered the Lord is *YHWH*, from which it is evident, that at the time when Joseph was taken to Egypt, the Egyptians worshipped the God of the Hebrews. The name of Jehovah was well known to them; and Pharaoh, speaking of Joseph, said, *a man in whom is the spirit of God*.—And the ruler of the house of Joseph acknowledges not only the true God, but also his superintending providence, ch. xlii. 23.

6. *He knew not ought he had.* This expression is incorrect. The word *ilho* is omitted in the common version, which should be rendered *without him*: he had delivered all his concerns into the hand of Joseph; it then follows in the original, *he knew not without him what he had*. The lord of Joseph certainly knew that he had great abundance, but he did not know the amount of all his property without the information which only Joseph could give him. Therefore the word *ought* is improper, as it precludes the possibility of his knowing what was his, *except the bread he was eating*, or the provision of his table.

8. *Woteth.* The word *yadach* literally means *knoweth*.

lord; Behold, my lord knoweth not what is with me in the house; and all that he hath he gave into my hand;

9 There is none greater than me in this house, for he hath not withheld any thing from me, except thyself, because thou art his wife: therefore if I do this great evil, then I sin before God.

10 Thus it was, that she spake to Joseph, day after day: but he hearkened not to her, to remain near her, or to be with her.

11 Now it was at this time, that he went into the house to transact his business; and not a man of the house was there in the house,

12 That she caught him by his garment saying, Lie with me; but he left his garment in her hand; then he fled, and went forth abroad.

13 Then it was, when she saw that he had left his garment in her hand, and fled abroad:

14 That she called to the men of her house, and she spake to them saying; See ye, that he hath brought to us a man of the Hebrews, to sport with us: he came to me to lie with me, but I cried with a loud voice.

15 So it was when he heard that I raised my voice, and cried: that he left his garment with me; then he fled and went forth abroad.

16 So she laid down his garment by her, till his lord came, to his house.

17 Then she spake to him according to these words, saying: The Hebrew, the servant that thou hast brought for us, came to me to sport with me.

18 So it was when I raised my voice, and cried: that he left his garment with me, and fled abroad.

19 Now it was, when his Lord heard the words of his wife which she spake to him saying; Ac-

12. *And got him out.* This is one of the uncouth expressions introduced by the translators into our language; a provincial vulgar mode of expression. And as the Bible is always esteemed to be the standard of the language, being read in families, and regularly before the public; it is evident that so long as such phrases are retained, they must necessarily keep the language in an uncultivated state among the generality of hearers, which becomes disgusting to the intelligent. The word *וַיֵּצֵא* *yetsaea* is literally, as well as elegantly, rendered, and he went forth.

14. *To mock us.* *prits Letsachek*, literally reads, to sport.

22. *Whatsoever they did there, he was the doer of it.* The repetition of the verb, with this choice of the word, reads awkwardly. *וַיַּעַשׂ* *Gnaseh*, agreeably to idiom, should be rendered by *manager*.

ording to these words did thy servant to me: that his anger was kindled.

20 Then the lord of Joseph took him, and put him into the house of the prison; a place wherein the prisoners of the king were punished: so he was there in the house of the prison.

21 But JEHOVAH was with Joseph, and he extended mercy to him: for he gave him favour in the sight of the governor of the prison-house.

22 Then the governor of the house of the prison, gave into the hand of Joseph, even all the prisoners who were in the prison-house: for whatsoever they did there, he was the manager.

23 The governor of the house of the prison looked not to any thing in his hand, because JEHOVAH was with him; for whatsoever he did, JEHOVAH made to prosper.

CHAP. XL.

¶ NOW it was after these transactions, that the butler and the baker, had offended the king of Egypt: even their lord, the king of Egypt.

2 And Pharaoh was wroth, with two of his officers; against the governor of the butlers, and against the governor of the bakers.

3 So he gave them to the keeper of the house, the captain of the guard, into the house of the prison; the place where Joseph was confined.

4 Then the governor of the guard charged Joseph with them, so Joseph attended them; for they continued a season with the keeper.

5 Moreover they both dreamed a dream, each his dream in one night, each alike expounded his dream: the butler and the baker, of the king of Egypt, who were bound in the house of the prison.

6 Now Joseph came to them in the morning,

NOTES ON CHAP. XL.

3. *Where Joseph was bound.* Heb. *where Joseph was confined.* This is plain that Joseph was not bound, because he had the superintendence of the whole prison; therefore must have had his personal liberty within the prison.

5. *According to the interpretation of his dream.* This must appear evidently wrong in the common version, because it is said in the 8th verse, *We have dreamed a dream, and there is no interpreter.* *לֹא מִתְּפָּרֵשׁ* *Ki phithron*, which is rendered, according to the interpretation, is properly translated, according to the description; for they described their dreams to Joseph, they did not interpret them.

8. *Do not interpretations belong to God?* Here we find that Joseph, who had succeeded to the priesthood on the defection of Reuben, retained the office and character in Egypt. The

and he observed them; for behold they were troubled.

7 He then asked the officers of Pharaoh who were with him, in the ward of the house of his lord, saying: Wherefore are your countenances sad to day?

8 And they said to him; A dream we have dreamed, but there is no interpreter of it: then Joseph said to them, Are not interpretations from God? declare ye now to me.

9 So the chief of the butlers told his dream to Joseph, and he said to him; In my dream, now behold a vine, before my face:

10 And in the vine, three branches, and the same budded, her blossoms burst forth into clusters of ripe grapes.

11 With the cup of Pharaoh in my hand, then I took the grapes and I pressed them into the cup of Pharaoh, also I gave the cup into the hand of Pharaoh:

12 Then Joseph said to him, This is the interpretation: Three branches, *mean* three days.

13 Again, in three days, Pharaoh will raise thy head, for he will restore thee to thy station; and thou wilt give the cup of Pharaoh into his hand, according to the former manner, when thou wast his butler.

14 Therefore remember me with thyself, as it will be well with thee, and deal mercifully I pray thee with me: mention me to Pharaoh, and bring me forth from this house.

Egyptians at this period, 225 years before the Hebrews left Egypt, were evidently worshippers of God; the same language, manners, and customs, prevailed there as in Canaan; Joseph married the daughter of the priest of On, and in those patriarchal times the kings and governors were also priests. When his brethren came before him they knew that he was a priest, for he said, *Know ye not that such a man as I can certainly divine?* which would have been a very improper, and an undignified affirmative question, had they not known that he was a priest.

11. And I took the grapes and pressed them into the cup of Pharaoh. Thus we learn that the fresh expressed juice of grape, without fermentation, was the wine of the Hebrews.

12. Three branches are three days. Branches cannot be days; Heb. Three branches mean three days.

It is not an easy matter to form a proper conception of that state which the spirit of man is in when his body is inactive in sleep; while his soul, in a body, is enjoying all those things connected with the senses. That the word *ovim* *chealom*, rendered properly by *dream*, or *vision*, was of this description, is plain. Joseph was singular as to his dreams, which were well understood by his father; for, as was observed, the sun and moon and eleven stars were understood to mean his father,

15 For I was privately stolen, from the land of the Hebrews, and here also I have not done any thing; though they have put me into the dungeon.

16 When the chief baker saw that the interpretation was good; then he said to Joseph, I also was in my dream; and behold, three white baskets were upon my head.

17 Now in the uppermost basket, was some of all food for Pharaoh, the work of the baker: and the birds ate them from the basket, from above my head.

18 Then Joseph answered, and said, This is the interpretation: the three baskets *mean* three days.

19 Now in three days, Pharaoh, will lift thy head higher than thee; yea he will hang thee upon a tree, till the bird shall eat thy flesh from off thee.

20 So it was, on the third day, the birth-day of Pharaoh, when he made a feast for all his servants; that he raised the head of the chief of the butlers, and the head of the chief of the bakers, in the midst of his servants.

21 Then he restored the chief of the butlers, to his butlership: and he gave the cup into the hand of Pharaoh.

22 And the chief of the bakers, he hanged; as Joseph had interpreted to them.

23 Now the chief of the butlers mentioned not Joseph, but forgot him.

mother, and brethren. That some dreams have a higher signification than they have in common, when intended to answer the purposes of God in his providence, must necessarily be allowed by every believer in the sacred volume. Such were the visions of Joseph. God had decreed the redemption of his people; to break in pieces the idols of Canaan; and Joseph, in the order of Divine Providence, was the appointed instrument to prepare the Hebrews as a nation to establish the sacred Shechinah in the holy land.

23. The reason given in the old translation why the chief butler did not remember Joseph is, *that he forgot him*. It must appear to the intelligent reader that the translation is wrong, or that there is an unnecessary repetition in the original; for if a person does not remember, he must of course forget. זָכַר *Zachar*, is rendered *remember*; but, according to the idiom of the verb, it also means to *mention*; see Job xxviii. 18, *No mention shall be made*; Ezek. xviii. 24, *shall not be mentioned*;—xxxiii. 16, &c. And as in the 14th verse the same word in Hiphil, with the oblique case of the first person, is so translated, when he requested him to *mention* him to Pharaoh, I have rendered the verse conformably to this and to other scriptures; so that the reason why he did not mention Joseph was, because he had forgotten, until the dreams of Pharaoh brought him to his recollection.

CHAP. XLI.

¶ NOW it was, at the end of two years; that Pharaoh dreamed; and behold, he stood by the river.

2 When lo, from the river, ascended seven steers; fair in appearance, and firm of flesh: and they fed, in a meadow.

3 Then behold seven other steers ascended after them from the river; diseased in appearance, also thin of flesh: and stood near the steers, upon the brink of the river.

4 So the diseased in appearance, even the thin-fleshed steers; did eat the seven steers, fair to appearance and firm: then Pharaoh awoke.

5 Moreover he slept and dreamed again: when behold, seven ears of corn, ascended on one stalk, firm and good.

6 And lo, seven ears, thin and blasted eastward; sprung forth after them.

7 Then the thin ears swallowed the seven firm and full ears: so Pharaoh awoke, and behold it was a dream.

8 Now it was in the morning that his spirit was troubled, then he sent and called for all the magicians of Egypt, yea even for all the wise: and Pharaoh declared to them his dreams; but no one interpreted them to Pharaoh.

9 Then spake the chief of the butlers, to Pharaoh saying: I remember my fault this day.

10 Pharaoh was angry with his servants, and he gave me to the keeper of the house, the captain of the guard; with me also the chief of the bakers.

11 And we dreamed a dream in one night, I

and he each according to the description of his dream, we dreamed.

12 Now there was with us a Hebrew youth, servant to the captain of the guard; so we declared to him, and he interpreted to us, our dreams: he interpreted to each according to his dream.

13 And it happened as he interpreted to us; so it was: he restored me to my office, but he hanged him.

14 Then Pharaoh sent and called for Joseph; so they brought him out of the dungeon: when he had shaved and changed his raiment, then he came before Pharaoh.

15 Now Pharaoh said to Joseph; A dream I have dreamed, but none interpret it: now I have heard say concerning thee, thou wilt understand a dream to interpret it.

16 Then Joseph answered Pharaoh, saying, It is not in me; God will answer Pharaoh in peace.

17 Thus Pharaoh spake to Joseph: In my dream, behold me standing upon the bank of the river:

18 When lo, from the river, ascended seven steers, firm fleshed, even of a beautiful form: and they fed, in a meadow.

19 And behold seven other steers ascended after them, exceedingly exhausted, ill formed, and thin fleshed; such I never saw in all the land of Egypt among the worst.

20 Then the lean and bad steers, devoured the seven former firm steers.

21 When they came to their entrails, yet it

NOTES ON CHAP. XLI.

2. *Well favoured.* A very improper translation; there is no word that means either *well* or *favoured*. יפות מראה *Yephoth mareh*, mean *fair to appearance*; and ובריאת בשר *ve berioth basar*, rendered *fat-fleshed*, mean *firm-fleshed*.

6. *Blasted with the east wind.* This translation has been admitted and followed by all the European translators, who have incorporated three words in the text for which they had no authority, viz. *with the wind*. The sacred penman does not describe by what means the ears were blasted; this was not necessary; it was enough for him to say, as he has said, that they were *blasted*. He here describes the situation of the kine and of the ears of corn, as he stood upon the bank of the river, viz. קראדמ *kardim*, eastward; for so this word is rendered, Ezek. xlvii. 2, 3;—xliii. 17;—the east, xlv. 1;—xlvii. 1.

This verse contains two propositions in the Hebrew, but in the common version no attention has been paid to this important branch of Hebrew reading. Neither is there any division made in the first proposition, as in the original, by which great force of expression is lost. The common version

says, *Seven thin ears, and blasted with the east wind*; but as *Katon* is upon שבלים *shibolim*, ears, and *Atnah* upon קראדמ *kardim*, eastward, the true reading is as in the new translation.

8. *Magicians.* This word is very improperly rendered *magicians*, but it is plainly derived from חרט *charat*, a pen, Isa. viii. 1; a graver, Exod. xxxii. 4. It means the *learned*; interpreters of things abstruse.

And all the wise men thereof. These were the same persons, though by the improper translation of the *vau*, they appear to be two descriptions of men. The *vau* is explanatory, and should be translated by *even*; *even all the wise of Egypt*, for the word *men* is not in the Hebrew: it is the same as if we said, *all the learned, even all the philosophers*.

10. *Both me and the chief baker,* Heb. *with me also the chief of the bakers.*

17. *I stood upon the bank of the river.* The fertility of a great part of Egypt depends on the overflowing of the river Nile; therefore a more proper signification of plenty could not have been represented to Pharaoh, than the *fat kine grazing* in

was not known that they had come to their ent-
trails; for they looked worse, than at the begin-
ning: and I awoke.

22 Moreover I saw in my dream; and behold,
seven ears ascended on one stalk, full and good:

23 And lo, seven ears withered, thin, blasted
eastward; budded after them;

24 So the thin ears swallowed the seven good
ears: then I spake to the magicians, but none
declare it to me.

25 Now Joseph said to Pharaoh; The dream
of Pharaoh is one: even that which God is
doing, he declareth to Pharaoh.

26 The seven good steers *mean* seven years,
and the seven good ears, *mean* seven years: the
dream is one.

27 Also the seven steers thin and bad, that
ascended after them, *mean*, seven years; and
seven had ears blasted towards the east: will be
seven years of famine.

28 This thing, that I have spoken to Pharaoh;
which God is doing, he sheweth to Pharaoh.

29 Behold, seven years shall come of great
abundance, in all the land of Egypt.

30 Then seven years of famine shall arise after
them; when all the abundance shall be forgotten
in the land of Egypt: and the famine shall con-
sume the land:

31 Thus the abundance will not be regarded
in the land, before the face of the famine that
followeth: because it *will be* very grievous.

32 Now because the dream was double to
Pharaoh twice: surely God hath established the
thing; yea God hasteneth, to accomplish it.

33 Therefore now let Pharaoh provide a man
prudent and wise; and set him over the land of
Egypt.

a meadow. On the other hand, the contrast is equally as
striking; the seven lean kine prefigured a total want of the
usual produce of the land, arising from the customary over-
flowing of the river. *The kine and the corn:* thus the whole
produce of the country was to be affected, and it might with
propriety be said, that the cattle came out of the river, as the
fertility of the country depended on it.

30. *Consumes the land.* This form of speech is improper as
it stands in the old version, for the land could not be con-
sumed, nor are we to be told that the produce may be under-
stood; according to the original, so it ought to be translated.
na Eth, which means the *substance* of the thing spoken of, is
not noticed; but as the *n ha*, emphatic, i.e. *the*, is prefixed to
eretz, land, it will appear that this clause should have
been translated, *the substance of the land*.

38, 39. It must appear evident that the worship of the true

34 Pharaoh must prepare; and appoint offi-
cers over the land: even a fifth of the land of
Egypt, in the seven years of the abundance;

35 Then they shall gather all the food of
those good years that come; but they shall
gather corn under the hand of Pharaoh, where
they shall keep food in the cities.

36 And that food shall be for stores in the
land, before the seven years of famine, which
shall be in the land of Egypt: then the land
shall not be cut off by famine.

37 Now the thing was good in the eyes of
Pharaoh, and in the eyes of all his servants.

38 Then Pharaoh said to his servants: Have
we found such a man as this? for the spirit of
God is in him.

39 Therefore Pharaoh said to Joseph; Since
God hath caused thee to know all this; no one
is prudent and wise like to thee.

40 Thou, thou shalt be over my house; yea
by thy order all my people shall be ruled: only
upon the throne, I will be greater than thee.

41 Also Pharaoh said to Joseph: See, I have
set thee over all the land of Egypt.

42 Then Pharaoh took his ring from off his
hand, which he put upon the hand of Joseph;
and he arrayed him in garments of linen, and
put a chain of gold about his neck.

43 Moreover he rode with him in the second
chariot which *was* for him; when they proclaimed,
before his face, bow the knee: thus he set him
over all the land of Egypt.

44 Again Pharaoh said to Joseph, *I am* Pha-
raoh: and without thee, no man shall raise his
hand, or even his foot, in all the land of Egypt.

45 So Pharaoh called the name of Joseph,
Zaphnath-paaneah; and he gave to him Asenath

God was taught in Egypt at this period, otherwise, had they
been idolaters, Pharaoh would not have preferred Joseph.
The passage is very striking, *Can we find such a man as this?*
the spirit of God is in him.

43. *Bow the knee.* The word *abrecke*, is translated, *low*
the knee. This however is not the precise meaning, for there is no
word for *low*. The custom of bowing the knee when this
word was pronounced, by way of gratitude, or humiliation, may
be admitted; but it means something more expressive. It is a
compound word, of *na* a father, and *rak*, tender, or affection-
ate, viz. *the affectionate father.* The man who was appointed by
God, not only to save the nations from the effects of the famine,
but to increase his people, to bring about his purposes, and to
establish them in the place which he had chosen to fix his name
there; even Jerusalem, agreeably to his promise to Abraham.

In the second chariot which he had. There can be no doubt

the daughter of Poti-pherah priest of On, for a wife: then Joseph went forth over the land of Egypt.

46 Now Joseph was thirty years old, when he stood before the face of Pharaoh king of Egypt: thus Joseph went forth from the presence of Pharaoh, and passed throughout all the land of Egypt.

47 So the earth, produced in the seven years of abundance: by handfuls.

48 Then he gathered all the provision of seven years, which were in the land of Egypt; and he delivered provision in the cities: the provision of the field, that surrounded the city, he delivered in the same manner.

49 Thus Joseph collected corn as the sand of the sea, which he increased exceedingly: till that he ceased to number, then *there was no numbering.*

50 Moreover to Joseph were born two sons, before the years of famine came, whom Asenath bare to him; the daughter of Poti-pherah, priest of On.

51 And Joseph called the name of the first-born Manasseh: for God hath caused me to forget all my labour, and all the house of my father.

52 But the name of the second, he called Ephraim: for God hath caused me to be fruitful in the land of my affliction.

53 When the seven years of abundance, which were in the land of Egypt, ended,

that the chariot was Pharaoh's. The translation of אשר לו, *asher lo*, by, *which he had*, is not correct; it reads, with the verb understood, *which was for him.*

And he made him ride. Heb. and he rode with him. So that Pharaoh rode with Joseph in the second chariot, which was for him, i.e. for Joseph.

45. *Zaphnath-paaneah*. Some commentators cover with conjecture and uncertainty what they do not understand, and have said that "The meaning of this title is little known." It may be so to those who have not attended to the Hebrew. The word נִצַּן *Zaphnath*, is obviously from the root נִצַּן *tsaphan*, to hide, conceal, lay up, that which is secret; and so it refers to the hidden, the divine communications of Joseph, who was the successor to the priesthood.

נִצַּן *Paaneah*, is a compound word, from נָצַח *yaaphang*, to shine, to shine forth, Deut. xxxiii. 2, *He shined forth from* (Heb. or) mount Paran. That was in the Holy of Holies on mount Paran, when the divine communication was given, which was the *seraphic state of the Cherubim*. See on Numb. xxi. 8, where this state of the Cherubim is fully explained. And from נָצַח *naach*, to lead, guide, direct; and thus the words *Zaphnath-paaneah*, make a sentence, which applies also to God, who revealed the hidden things by Joseph, viz. *The secret*

54 Then the seven years of the famine began to come, as Joseph had said: yea there was famine in all the lands; but in all the land of Egypt, was bread.

55 Now all the land of Egypt suffered hunger, and the people cried to Pharaoh for bread: then Pharaoh said to all Egyptians, Go ye to Joseph; whatsoever he shall say to you, ye shall do.

56 Yea the famine was over all the face of the land; then Joseph opened all the stores, and sold to the Egyptians; thus the famine prevailed in the land of Egypt.

57 Moreover all the earth came to Egypt, to buy of Joseph; because the famine prevailed in all the earth.

CHAP. XLII.

WHEN Jacob saw, that there was corn in Egypt, then Jacob said to his sons; For what look ye?

2 Moreover he said, Behold, I have heard, that there is corn in Egypt; descend ye thither, and buy ye for us from thence; then we shall live, and not die.

3 So the ten brethren of Joseph descended; to buy corn, in Egypt.

4 But Benjamin the brother of Joseph, Jacob sent not with his brethren: for he said; Because mischief will befall him.

5 So the sons of Israel came to buy corn, among those that came; for the famine was in the land of Canaan.

shining forth of the counsellor; see Job xxxi. 18. Referring, as above, to the interval when the divine communication was delivering from above the Cherubim.

50. *Priest of On*. Originally an Egyptian word, signifying the sun. It is applied to the first-born, Gen. xlix. 3; the *beginning of strength*, Deut. xxi. 17. The name of a city in Egypt, 1700 years after this period, called by the Septuagint Heliopolis, or the city of the sun. Before the time of the Septuagint translators, it appears that this people worshipped the sun, or the material light, as the strength or first-born of creation; but that the word *pn On*, or *pn Oun*, was originally applied to mean the *Essence*, the inmost, or essential principles of God, and that this city was dedicated to the worship of him who said, *BE LIGHT, and light was*, is obvious. We find the same word used by the apostle to mean the self-existing God, Rev. i. 4, *ὉΝ he that is*; and Ezek. xxx. 17, *pn Oun*.

NOTES ON CHAP. XLII.

1. *Why do ye look one upon another?* Four words are supplied in this short clause, for which there is not any authority in the original, viz. *do—one upon another*. The Hebrew is far more expressive, *For what look ye?*

2. *Get you down*. Heb. *Descend ye*.

6 Now Joseph was the governor of the land, he caused the distribution to all the people of the land; so the brethren of Joseph went, and bowed themselves before him, *with* their faces to the earth.

7 When Joseph saw his brethren (for he knew them: but made himself strange to them, and spake to them harshly) then he said to them, From whence come ye? and they replied; From the land of Canaan to buy food.

8 Thus Joseph knew his brethren: but they knew him not.

9 Now Joseph remembered the dreams, which he dreamed concerning them: and he said to them, Even ye *are* vagrants, to see the nakedness of the land, ye are come.

10 Then they said to him, No my lord: thy servants come to buy food.

11 All of us sons of one man, we are faithful men, thy servants are not vagrants.

12 But he said to them: No, surely to see the nakedness of the land you come.

13 Moreover they said, Thy servants are twelve brethren, we are the sons of one man in the land of Canaan; and behold the youngest is with our father this day; but one is not.

14 Then Joseph said to them: This is that I have spoken to you, saying, Ye are vagrants.

15 By this shall ye be proved: by the life of Pharaoh, ye shall not go forth hence; except your youngest brother come hither.

16 Send ye one of you, and bring your bro-

That we may live. Heb. Then we shall live.

3. *And Joseph's ten brethren went down. Heb. So the ten brethren of Joseph descended.*

7. *And spake roughly. Heb. And spake to them harshly.*

8. *And Joseph knew his brethren. This is said in the beginning of the former verse, therefore could not be mentioned again in this form. Heb. Thus Joseph knew his brethren.*

11. *We are all one man's sons. Heb. All of us sons of one man.*

16. *Whether there be any truth in you. Heb. Whether truth be in you. The words, there be any, are supplied.*

22. From this it appears that Reuben did not know what had become of Joseph. When he returned to the pit, in order to restore him to his father, and found him not, he might conclude that he was destroyed by some beast.

23. *He spake unto them by an interpreter. The word מְדַבֵּר, rendered an interpreter, does not always mean a person who translates from one language into another. It means an expounder of the law, Job xxxiii. 23; teachers, Isa. xliii. 27; an interuicio, an attendant, a mediator. If we attend to the history, we shall be convinced that the language of Egypt was at this period the same as the language of Canaan. I have observed in another part, that when the brethren of Joseph went, they conversed without an interpreter*

ther, for ye shall be bound; and your words shall be proved, whether truth *be* in you: but if not, by the life of Pharaoh, surely ye are vagrants.

17 And he put them together with a keeper, three days.

18 Then Joseph said to them on the third day; This do ye, and ye shall live: for I fear God.

19 If ye be just, one of you shall be bound in the house of your keeper: then go ye, carry corn for the famine of your houses.

20 But your youngest brother ye shall bring to me; so your words will be verified, then ye shall not die: and they did so.

21 Now they said, each to his brother, Indeed we are guilty concerning our brother; for we saw the anguish of his soul, when he made supplication to us, but we heard him not: therefore is this distress come upon us.

22 Then Reuben answered them saying, Spake I not to you, saying, Ye shall not sin against the youth, but ye hearkened not: therefore behold now, his blood is required.

23 But they knew not, that Joseph hearkened: inasmuch as the mediator was between them.

24 So he turned from before them, and wept: but he returned to them, and conversed with them; then he took Simeon from them, and bound him in their sight.

25 Then Joseph commanded even to fill their

with the steward of the house of Joseph, ch. xliii. 19. The customs of the ancient Egyptians being understood, will elucidate this part of scripture.

The monarchs of the East always assumed great dignity; the Egyptian kings, and those exercising supreme power, sat alone to eat, and never condescended to speak to strangers, or to those who solicited favours. Their pleasure was signified by the officer whose duty it was to transact the business between them.

It evidently appears that the Egyptians spake the Hebrew language at this period; they descended from Mizraim the son of Ham, and Egypt is called in scripture Mizraim, after him. From the deluge to Abraham was 352 years; therefore during this short period it must appear that no change could take place in the language of Egypt, the language of Noah, the Hebrew language, which we find was spoken by them when Abraham went there; whose grandson Jacob and the patriarchs settled there. Joseph, it appears, spake the same language, for immediately after he was taken to the house of Potiphar, he reasoned with his wife on the wickedness of the crime she proposed; and on his lord returning home, when he was committed to prison, the keeper of the prison gave the whole management of the prisoners and their work into his hand; a

sacks with corn, and to return their money every one, into his sack; also to give them provision for the journey: thus he provided for them.

26 So they carried the corn upon their asses, and departed thence.

27 Now one had opened his sack to give provender to his ass at the inn; and he saw his money, for behold it *was* in the mouth of his sack.

28 And he said to his brethren, My money is restored; yea even behold, it is in my sack: and their heart failed, for they trembled, each one for his brother, saying, What now hath God done to us?

29 Then they came to Jacob their father, in the land of Canaan; and told him all that had happened them, saying;

30 The man, the lord of the land, spake harshly with us; and he delivered us, like vagrants of the land.

31 And we said to him, We are established, we are not vagrants.

32 We *were* twelve brethren, the sons of our father: one *is* not, and the youngest *is* this day with our father in the land of Canaan.

33 Then the man, the lord of the land said to us, By this I shall know, that ye are established: leave one of your brethren with me, then take ye for the famine of your households, and depart.

34 Moreover, bring ye your youngest brother, to me; then I shall know that you are not vagrants, but *that ye are* established: so I will deliver your brother to you, and ye shall traffic in the land.

35 Now were their sacks emptied; and be-

thing very unlikely had he not understood the language of the country.

24. *And took from them Simeon, and bound him before their eyes.* From the circumstance of Joseph's selecting Simeon, it appears that he must have been the first who proposed to put him to death.

25. *And thus did he unto them.* Heb. *Thus he provided for them.*

27. *It was in his sack's mouth.* Heb. *It was in the mouth of his sack.*

28. *And now hath God done.* The simplicity and sincerity of the patriarchs in their dependence on God, and in the belief of his retributive justice, must be obvious to the reader. They attributed every occurrence to the interposition of God in his providence.

30. *Spake roughly.* Heb. *Spake harshly.*

And took us for spics. Heb. *And he delivered us like vagrants of the land.*

38. *My grey hairs.* Heb. *My greyness.*

hold, the money of each *was* bound in his sack: then they *were* afraid when they saw the money bound up, also their father then feared.

36 Moreover Jacob their father said to them; You have bereaved me: Joseph *is* not, and Simeon *is* not; now will ye even take Benjamin? all things have been against me.

37 Then spake Reuben to his father saying, Thou shalt slay my two sons, if I bring him not, to thee: deliver him into my hand, and I will bring him to thee.

38 But he said, My son shall not go down with you: for his brother *is* dead, and *he is* left alone, if mischief befall him in the way which ye go, then shall ye bring down my greyness with sorrow to the grave.

CHAP. XLIII.

NOW the famine was grievous in the land.

2 And it was, when they had about eaten all the corn, which they had brought from Egypt, that their father said to them, Return ye, buy for us a little food.

3 Then Judah spake to him, saying: The man warning protested to us, saying, Ye shall not see my face, except your brother *be* with you.

4 If thou wilt send our brother with us, we will descend; and buy food for thee.

5 But if thou wilt not send, we will not depart: for the man said to us, Ye shall not see my face; except your brother *be* with you.

6 Then Israel said; Wherefore have ye afflicted me; by declaring to the man; whether ye had yet a brother?

7 But they said, The man inquiring asked

NOTES ON CHAP. XLIII.

2. *When they had eaten.* It is not likely that the families of Jacob would have waited until all the corn was eaten before they had procured another supply. The *h* *lamed*, prefixed to *kol*, *eat*, requires the same sense as in *Zech. ix. 8*, ABOUT my house; *Exod. xxviii. 32*, about; so that the families had about, almost eaten the food; they had enough left to serve them until their return from Egypt.

3. *Did solemnly protest unto us.* There is no authority for the words *did*, and *solemnly*; *וְיָרָא הֶעָנָנִי*, rendered *solemnly*, means a charge, see *Exod. xix. 21*; and *וְיָרָא הֶעָנָנִי*, to testify or witness, 2 Kings xvii. 15; Mal. ii. 14.

7. *The man asked straitly of our state.* This clause is improperly translated; there is no authority in the original for the words *straitly of our state*; *בְּמַה שְׁאָלָה*, rendered *straitly*, is the third person singular preter of the verb to ask; see the same word properly so translated, *Gen. xli. 19*; *Jud. v. 25*.

concerning us, and concerning our families, saying, Is your father yet alive? have ye a brother? then we told to him, according to the tenor of these words: by acknowledging could we know that he would say; Bring ye your brother?

8 Also Judah said to Israel his father, Send the youth with me, and we will arise and go: then we shall live, and shall not die, both we, also thou, and our young ones.

9 I, I will be surety, at my hand thou shalt require him: if I bring him not to thee, nor set him before thy face; then I will be blameable before thee, all my days.

10 For except we had delayed, surely now we had returned this time.

11 Then their father Israel said to them, If so, do this; take ye some of the choice fruits of the land in your vessels; and carry ye down a gift for the man: a little balm and a little honey, spices and myrrh, nuts and almonds.

12 Also take double money in your hand, and the money which was brought in the mouth of your sacks, ye shall return him in your hand; perhaps it was a mistake.

13 Moreover also take ye your brother: then arise, return ye to the man.

14 And GOD ALMIGHTY give to you mercy before the face of the man; then he will send with you your other brother, and Benjamin: thus accordingly as I was deprived, I am deprived.

15 Then the men took this present, also they took double money in their hand, with Benjamin: so they arose and went down to Egypt, and stood in the presence of Joseph.

16 When Joseph had seen them, with Benja-

6. *We will arise and go, that we may live.* Properly speaking there is no subjunctive mood; the subjunctive presumes the existence of something which is not, therefore it cannot be subjoined: thus the propriety of there being no such mood in the Hebrew language; consequently the word *may* is improper here, particularly as the idiom of our language does not require it.

12. *Peradventure it was an oversight, נאםו mishgah, is one word, viz. a mistake.*

18. *That he may seek occasion.* לְחַשׁוֹלֵל *lechishgoel*, is rendered, *that he may seek occasion*; but this word has no such meaning, words being put into the common version which are not authorized by the original. This word means to *roll*, to *press*, to *move*, against, or upon; it is in the Hithpaal conjugation, and should be translated accordingly.

20. *We come indeed down at the first time, to buy food.* The reader will see that this mode of expression cannot be allowed; the word *indeed* is not only improper, but the original

min, then he said to the ruler of his house; Bring the men home; also slay and prepare, for the men shall eat with me at noon;

17 Then the man made ready, as Joseph commanded; and the man brought the men, to the house of Joseph.

18 But the men were afraid when they were brought to the house of Joseph; and they said, Because of the portion of money returned in our sacks at the beginning, we are brought: for he will move himself against us, yea he himself will fall upon us; even to take us for servants, and our asses.

19 Then they drew near to the man, who was over the house of Joseph; and they spake to him, at the door of the house,

20 And said, When my lord, oppressed, we descended at the beginning, to buy food;

21 Thus it was, when we arrived at the inn, that we opened our sacks, and behold, the money of each, was in the mouth of his sack; our money in weight: so we have brought it in our hand.

22 Also other money we have brought in our hand to buy food: we knew not who put our money in our sacks.

23 And he said, Peace to you, fear ye not, your God, even the God of your father hath given to you, the treasure in your sacks; your money came before me: then he brought forth Simeon to them.

24 When the steward had brought the men, to the house of Joseph, then he provided water, and they bathed their feet; also he gave provender, for their asses.

25 Now they had prepared the present, before

word has no such meaning. It is evidently improper, because the person who was the ruler of the house of Joseph knew them, and consequently their business, at their first coming.

The original word *וַיַּעַרְדוּ* *ya'aradu*, which is translated by, *indeed*, has no such meaning: it is applicable to all the states in which the word *descend* can be understood, in all its various inflections; primarily to *descend*, to *cast down*, to *subdue*, to be *reduced*, or *oppressed*, to come down from a higher to a lower condition; Deut. xxviii. 43, and thou shalt come down very low; Isa. xliii. 14, and have brought down all their nobles; Jer. xiii. 8; Sam. i. 9; Ezek. xxx. 6. And thus it is applicable to those states when the mind is oppressed.

24. *And the man brought the men.* Here in the old version we have the same expression as in the 17th verse; there was no necessity to be told twice, objectors say, that the man brought the men into the house of Joseph. This is true, but it does not occur in this form in the Hebrew. The verb is connected with the pluperfect tense, which refers to the interval

Joseph's coming at noon: for they understood that there they should eat bread.

26 When Joseph came to the house, then they brought before him the present which was in their hand, into the house: and they bowed themselves before him, to the earth.

27 Then he inquired concerning their welfare; and said, *Is your father well, the elder, of whom ye spake? is he yet alive?*

28 And they answered, Peace to thy servant even our father he yet lives: then they paid homage, and bowed.

29 Now he raised his eyes, and looked on Benjamin his brother, the son of his mother; and he said, *This is your younger brother, of whom ye spake, to me: then he said, God be gracious to thee my son.*

30 Now Joseph hastened, because his compassion kindled for his brother, where he sought to weep: so he went to the chamber, and wept there.

31 Then he washed his face, and he went forth, but he restrained himself: and said, Set on bread.

32 So they set on for him alone, and for them alone: also for the Egyptians who ate before him alone; because the Egyptians ate not bread with the Hebrews; for it was an abomination to the Egyptians.

33 Thus they sat in his presence; the first-born according to his birthright, but the youngest according to his youth: and the men wondered, each before his brother.

between the 17th and 24th verses, and this obviates the objection on the ground of a needless repetition.

25. *Made ready*, יָכִין *yankinou*, is not a compound word. Heb. prepared.

They heard. Heb. understood.

27. *The old man.* The word *man* does not here occur in the original. יָקֵן *Zakem*, means an *elder*, one who was the superior, or governor of the church, as Jacob was.

28. *Thy servant our father is in good health, he is yet alive.* This translation has not escaped the lash of objectors, and there is some ground for it as it stands in the old version. They say, "Surely after Jacob is declared to be in good health, there was no necessity to say, *he is yet alive.*" Truly so; but the translators have put in words for which they had not any authority, even a whole clause, viz. *he is in good health*; חַי וְשֶׁלֵּם *gnodous cha*, is literally, *he yet lives*; the original is expressive and dignified: *Peace to thy servant our father, he yet lives.*

29. *Is this your younger brother?* He does not ask the question as in the old translation, he required no answer.

30. *His bowels did yearn upon his brother.* However this might

34 Then he took and sent portions from before his face, for them; but the portion of Benjamin was five times the quantity of any of theirs: thus they drank, and feasted with him.

CHAP. XLIV.

MOREOVER he commanded the steward of his house, saying; Fill the sacks of the men with food, as much as they are able to carry; and put the money of every one into the mouth of his sack.

2 Then my cup, the silver cup, thou shalt put in the mouth of the sack of the youngest; with his corn-money: and he did according to the word which Joseph had spoken.

3 At the morning light, thus the men were sent away; they and their asses.

4 They went forth from the city, not far off; when Joseph said to the steward of his house; Arise, pursue after the men: when thou shalt overtake them, then thou shalt say to them; Wherefore have ye rendered evil, instead of good?

5 For this is it in which my lord drinketh; also divining will discover by it: such evil ye have done.

6 So he overtook them: and he spake to them these words.

7 But they said to him; For what reason sayeth my lord, these words? be it far from thy servants, to do according to this thing.

8 Behold, the money which we found in the mouth of our sacks; we brought to thee, from

be understood at the time of the translators, it is altogether obsolete now, as well as improper, for נִימְרוֹן וְרַחֲמֵי *nikmarou rachaman*, is applied to the mind, and not to the yearning of the bowels. *Nikmarou*, is truly rendered by the expressive word *kindled*; see Hosea xi. 8, *my repentings are kindled*. And *rachama*, translated *bowels*, means *compassion, tender mercies*, Lam. iii. 22; Psalm lxxvii. 9.

34. *And they drank, and were merry with him.* It appears from this text, as well as many others, that the language of Canaan at this period was the same as was spoken in Egypt. The word מְרִי *yishkiron*, which has been improperly rendered by the word *merry*, and which has given objectors an opportunity of speaking with levity on the conduct of Joseph and his brethren, means to be satisfied, Hagga'i, i. 6; Cant. v. 1. The Septuagint translate מְרִי *shakar*, by μεθύσκειν, to drink, but not to intoxication. The same root also means, *hire, wages*.

NOTES ON CHAP. XLIV.

5. *Ye have done evil in so doing.* Heb. *Such evil ye have done.* The words, *so doing*, are not sanctioned by the Hebrew.

the land of Canaan: how then should we steal from the house of thy lord, silver or gold?

9 With whom among thy servants he shall find it, then he shall die; and also we will be before my lord, for servants.

10 And he said, Even now it shall be according to your word: he with whom he shall find it, shall be before me a servant; but ye shall be blameless.

11 Then they hastened, and lowered each his sack to the ground; and every one opened his sack.

12 So he searched, beginning with the eldest; but finished with the youngest: and he found the cup in the sack of Benjamin.

13 Then they rent their garments, and loaded every one his ass; so they returned to the city.

7. *God forbid.* Heb. *Be it far.*

8. *Our suck's mouths.* Heb. *In the mouths of our sacks. Thy lord's house.* Heb. *The house of thy lord.*

12. *In Benjamin's sack.* Heb. *In the sack of Benjamin.*

14. *Joseph's house.* Heb. *The house of Joseph.*

15. *What deed is this?* This is not interrogative: Joseph knew what the deed was, and they were sensible that he knew it.

Wot ye not that such a man as I? Thus he alludes to the priesthood which had devolved on him; and as he had married the daughter of the priest of On, it is likely they understood he was a priest of On also: see chap. xli. 45.

That such a man as I can certainly divine. The words *וְנִי יְנַחֵשׁ* *yenacheesh*, are translated, *certainly divine*: but these two words have the same radical meaning, consequently *וְנִי nacheesh*, cannot be rendered by *certainly*. It means, to observe attentively, in order to discover; Gen. xxx. 27, *I have learned by experience.* Heb. *I have observed*; 1 Kings, xx. 33, *diligently observe.* The first word *וְנִי nacheesh*, is participial, and should be translated *divining*; but *וְנִי yenacheesh*, being the third person singular future of the verb, should be translated thus, *will discover*. The clause reads, *a man like me, divining, will discover.* Some commentators have given voluminous notes on this passage, in order to shew that divination by cups was prevalent among the Asiatics; and have blamed more intelligent commentators for attempting to clear Joseph from the impeachment of sorcery and divination. Some have even crowded their pages by saying, "There has been a tradition in the East, that there was a cup which had passed successively into the hands of different potentates, which possessed the strange property of representing in it the whole world, and all the things which were then doing in it." Such absurdities might be countenanced 200 years since, in the time of James, when the last revision of the scriptures was made, but certainly will not be countenanced in the present day.

It has been fully shewn on ch. xxxvii. 9, that Joseph had succeeded to the priesthood on the defection of Reuben. It also appears that the Egyptians at this period were worshippers of God, and that Joseph, who married the daughter of the priest of On, according to the custom of his profession, exercised the office of the priesthood during his life—that Jacob confirmed that order of the priesthood, viz. the priesthood of

14 Now Judah came, and his brethren, to the house of Joseph; for he was yet there: and they fell before his face to the ground.

15 And Joseph said to them; What a deed is this, which ye have done: know ye not, that a man like me, divining will discover?

16 Then Judah said; What shall we say to my lord? what shall we declare? or how shall we be justified? God hath found the iniquity of thy servants; behold us, servants of my lord; both we, also him in whose hand the cup is found.

17 But he said, Be it far from me, to do this: the man in whose hand the cup is found, he shall be before me a servant; but as for you, ascend ye in peace to your father.

18 Then Judah drew near to him, and said,

the firstborn, on the descendant of Joseph, even Ephraim, in whose line the representative priesthood, viz. of the Messiah, continued, till the Exodus, when the succession was changed, and the Levitical priesthood was established in the line of Aaron.

Therefore the cup, in which it is said in the common version, *Joseph divineth*, does not appear to have been a common vessel for household use, as is understood; but a *sacred vessel*. See where the word *בַּיִת gabyang*, means a *sacred vessel*, Jer. xxxv. 5, out of which they drank the consecrated wine in the holy place in the tabernacle before the Lord. See also where the sacred writer records the rites and ceremonies under that dispensation, Lev. xxiii. 13; Numb. xviii. 7. Therefore, in order to convict them with some degree of apparent truth, he contrived to make them appear as the worst of thieves, adding sacrilege to ingratitude, this being the sacramental cup.

The bread and wine, by divine appointment, was used in the ancient churches before that period, to signify their belief in the accomplishment of the promise for the redemption of man. This will appear in a stronger light if we turn to the 5th verse, where it is said, *is not this in which my Lord drinketh? and whereby indeed וְנִי he will divine*, viz. by pouring out the wine in the holy place before the Lord as above, when he received the communication from between the Cherubim.

16. *God hath found the iniquity of thy servants*, viz. their wickedness in persecuting their brother.

17. *God forbid*, *לֹא יִחַל chalah*, is rendered *God forbid*; but the word *God* does not occur in the verse. It is an unmeaning expression, which the error of the translators, and the abuse of custom, has rendered familiar. The word *forbid* has a directly contrary meaning; it is a compound of *fore*, anteriorly, and *lude*, the preterite of *bid*, to command. So that the word, according to its derivation, literally means that they were *bidden before* to do this thing. The original word is truly translated, Gen. xviii. 25, *that be far*; see 1 Sam. ii. 30;—xx. 9, *far be it*.

18. *Then Judah said.* The plan had now succeeded; they were brought back as criminals—they rent their clothes, an action expressive of the most poignant grief—they fell before Joseph—they appear guilty of the blackest ingratitude and sacrilege, though innocent—in a strange land, among their enemies—before an implacable judge, without an advocate—all was

O my lord; let thy servant I pray thee speak a word in the ears of my lord; and let not thine anger burn against thy servant: inasmuch as thou art like Pharaoh.

19 My lord asked his servants, saying: Have ye a father, or a brother?

20 Then we said to my lord; We have a father an elder, and a youth of his old age, the youngest: now his brother is dead; yea he alone is left of his mother, and his father loveth him.

21 Now thou saidst to thy servants; Bring him down to me: for I will set mine eyes upon him.

22 And we said to my lord; The youth cannot leave his father: if he leave his father, then he will die.

23 But thou saidst to thy servants; If your youngest brother come not down with you: ye shall no more see my face.

24 Now it was when we went to thy servant, my father; then we told to him the words of my lord.

25 Nevertheless, our father said: Return ye, buy ye for us a little food.

26 But we said, We cannot go down: if our youngest brother be with us, then we will go down; for we cannot see the face of the man, if our youngest brother be not with us.

27 Then thy servant my father, said to us: Ye know that my wife bare to me two;

lost, without hope of redemption; and it was left to the overwhelming eloquence of the temporal Judah. Judah seems to have been an eloquent man: he had engaged to bring Benjamin back to his father; but Benjamin is detained, and Joseph said, *Get you up in peace unto your father.* This was the moment for the manifestation of the most powerful of all eloquence, the eloquence of nature. Then Judah drew near and said, *Oh, my lord, let thy servant, I pray thee, speak a word in the ears of my lord.* His mother was dead; he touches the first springs of natural affection, *My lord asked his servants, saying, Have ye a father or a brother?* The chapter concludes one of the most energetic and moving speeches that ever was spoken, and Judah offers to suffer instead of Benjamin. Thus, I say, it was left to the lion-like Judah, who prevailed; and Joseph gave forth his voice with weeping.

O sacred and irresistible nature, planted in the soul by the Creator, whose overwhelming energies prove thy origin divine, how eloquent art thou! This narrative is a perfect copy of the irresistible dominion of pure natural affection, which, for the power it conveys in arresting the passions, is certainly the finest composition in the sacred scriptures, or that ever was composed by the most energetic writers. His brethren were at his feet, dreading his denunciation; their foul deed now appeared in its most horrid form when they recollected that they saw the an-

28 But one went forth from me; then I said, Surely a prey, he is torn: and I saw him not again.

29 If ye take this also from before my face, and mischief befall him: then ye will cause my greyness to descend, with sorrow to the grave.

30 Now therefore, when I come to thy servant my father; if the youth be not with us: for his soul, is bound up, in his soul;

31 Then it will be, when he seeth that the youth is not, that he will die: and thy servants will cause to descend the greyness of thy servant our father, with sorrow to the grave.

32 Truly thy servant became surety for the youth; to my father, saying: If I bring him not to thee; then I shall bear the blame before my father, all my days.

33 Now therefore, I pray thee, suffer thy servant to remain instead of the youth; a servant to my lord: yea suffer the youth to go up with his brethren:

34 For how shall I go up to my father, if the youth be not with me? because I shall see the evil, which will find my father.

CHAP. XLV.

NOW Joseph was not able to suppress himself, before all the officers with him; and he cried, Cause every man to go forth from before me: for not a man stood with him, when Joseph made himself known, to his brethren.

guish of the soul of Joseph. He besought them, but they would not hear, torn with the thought of the distress of their father, and the ruin of their families. When their judge said, I am Joseph,—they were silent—troubled at his presence. Then the first object of his affection, how natural! *my father yet liveth.* But his brethren could not answer him; his whole soul is described as filled with affection toward them, and the incomparable climax finishes with, *I am Joseph, your brother, whom ye sold into Egypt.*

28. Torn in pieces. Though the sense may be gathered from the common version, the translation is not right: there is no authority for the word *pieces*. The radical form of the word *קָרַע* *taaroph*, occurs twice in succession; it is one word, and means to *tear*, to be *torn*; a prey in consequence of being torn.

NOTES ON CHAP. XLV.

1. Joseph could not refrain himself. The word *בָּרַח* *hithaphak*, he could not any longer do violence to his feelings. The prevailing power of natural affection from the picture of the distress of his venerable father, so ardently drawn by the truly noble-minded Judah, who offered himself as a servant, to spare his father by returning Benjamin, burst through all restraint, and
2. He wept aloud. The Hebrew reads, *he gave forth his*

2 And he uttered his voice, with weeping: but the Egyptians hearkened; and the house of Pharaoh heard.

3 Then Joseph said to his brethren, I am Joseph; O yet my father liveth: but his brethren were not able to answer him; for they were troubled, at his presence.

4 And Joseph said to his brethren, Draw near now to me, so they drew near: then he said, I am Joseph your brother, whom ye sold into Egypt.

5 Now therefore ye shall not grieve, moreover, neither shall anger be in your eyes, because ye sold me hither: surely to preserve life, God sent me before your face.

6 But these two years of the famine, are in the midst of the land: there are yet five years, wherein will be neither plowing, nor harvest.

7 God sent me before your face, to settle for you a posterity in the earth: yea to save life among you, by a great deliverance.

8 Now therefore, you sent me not hither; but God: for he hath made me as a father to Pharaoh, yea even lord of all his house, and a ruler over all the land of Egypt.

9 Hasten ye and ascend to my father; for ye shall say to him, Thus saith thy son Joseph; God hath made me even a lord, over all Egypt: come down to me, stay thou not.

voice with weeping; which is certainly more proper, as weeping cannot be said to make a noise. Some commentators have supposed, because it is said, *The Egyptians and the house of Pharaoh heard*, that it was because of the great noise he made, which was heard to the house of Pharaoh. If this were so, the house of Pharaoh could not be far from the house of Joseph; and to justify this they have told us, that the "Asiatics make a great noise in their transports of joy or grief, that they may be heard twenty doors off." But there is no necessity for so trifling a subterfuge; it is absurd to suppose that the voice of Joseph should be heard in the house of Pharaoh. If we follow the plain sense of the narrative, we may see how it was heard in the house of Pharaoh; the Egyptians who were the officers of Joseph, when he ordered them to leave him, communicated the circumstance to the house of Pharaoh.

3. *Doth my father yet live?* This question could not be asked by Joseph; he had already been told, ch. xlii. 28, that Jacob was yet alive. The clause is not interrogatory; *וְיָגֵד*, requires to be translated as it is in various parts of scripture, by *yet*; and the *וְ* *ha*, prefixed, by *O*; See Deut. xxxii. 1; Cant. vi. 1; Ezek. xxxvii. 4; Mich. ii. 7. It is used by way of joyful exclamation in many parts of scripture.

6. *There shall be neither earing nor harvest.* This is incorrect; if there were *eoring*, it will appear that there must have been a harvest. *וְיָגֵד* *Chaarish*, rendered improperly by *eoring*, has no such meaning in any part of scripture. It signifies, to

10 For thou shalt dwell in the land of Goshen, where thou shalt be near to me; thou and thy children, also the children of thy children: with thy flocks and thy herds, even all that thou hast.

11 Yea I will provide for thee there; for yet are five years of famine: or thou wilt be impoverished, with thy house, and all that thou hast.

12 For behold, your eyes, and the eyes of my brother Benjamin have seen: that my mouth hath spoken to you.

13 Now you shall declare to my father, all my honour in Egypt; even all that ye have seen: therefore hasten ye, and bring ye down my father hither.

14 Then he fell on the neck of Benjamin his brother, and he wept: and Benjamin wept on his neck.

15 He also saluted all his brethren, and wept before them: then afterward likewise, his brethren conversed with him.

16 When the report was heard in the house of Pharaoh, saying; The brethren of Joseph are come: which was pleasing in the eyes of Pharaoh; and in the eyes of his servants;

17 Then Pharaoh said to Joseph; Say to thy brethren, This do ye: load your beasts, and depart; go ye to the land of Canaan.

18 Then take ye your father, also your house-

plow, Psa. cxxix. 3; 1 Kings, xix. 19; Isa. xxviii. 24, &c. The clause reads, *there shall be neither plowing nor harvest.*

8. *He hath made me a father to Pharaoh.* Some have objected to this mode of expression; but improperly. It is sufficiently plain; for as a father provides for his children, so he had provided for Pharaoh. But he gives the glory to God; *He hath made me a father to Pharaoh.* Something of the patriarchal institution was preserved even among the Caliphs: the Caliph, who was the emperor, was also a priest, and officiated himself every Friday, was called the father. This was the ancient custom; it is said Jud. xvii. 10, *Dwell with me, and be unto me a father and a priest.* Such was the custom among the Romans; their prefects were called fathers.

10. *And thou shalt dwell in the land of Goshen.* Goshen was one of the most easterly provinces of Egypt, extending to the river Nile on the west, and bounded by the land of Canaan on the east, with the Mediterranean sea on the north. It appears to have been peculiarly fertile, the best of the land of Egypt, ch. xlvii. 6, 11; and as the family of Joseph had now become the fathers or providers for the whole nation, this land was readily given to them, to provide sufficiently for the people. It is called Rameses from the principal city of that name, see ch. xlvii. 11.

Objectors have said that there are some things in the narrative concerning Joseph which strike the reader with inconsistency. Egypt was not more than three hundred miles from

hold, and come ye to me: for I will give to you, the best of the land of Egypt, yea ye shall eat the fat of the land.

19 Now thou art commanded, this do ye: Take ye for you, from the land of Egypt, carriages, for your little ones, and for your wives; then bring your father, thus ye shall come.

20 Moreover regard not your furniture; for the best of all the land of Egypt, shall be for you.

21 So the children of Israel made ready; for Joseph gave to them carriages, according to the commandment of Pharaoh; and he gave to them provision for the journey.

22 To all of them he gave for each, changes of raiment; but to Benjamin he gave three hundred *pieces* of silver, and five changes of raiment.

23 Moreover to his father he sent such things as these, ten asses, laden with the best of Egypt; also ten she asses bearing corn and bread, and some provisions for his father, on the journey.

24 Then he sent his brethren, so they departed; and he said to them; Ye shall not disagree on the journey.

Canaan, and it is surprising that during the time he was in Egypt, he never attempted to acquaint his father with his situation before he was raised to his dignity, nor after he became one of the greatest men in Egypt. With regard to the first, it is not at all likely that his lord who purchased him would allow him the opportunity, as he was so profitable a servant to him, for God had blessed him in all he did for his lord; neither could there be any desire in him to return, when he recollected that his brethren, if they had again gotten him into their hand, would in all probability have put him to death.

The greatest difficulty seems to be after his advancement; he was near nine years the first subject in Egypt, before the second year of the famine. But various reasons may be assigned for this delay. Had he, after he had delivered the communication concerning the famine, when all the eyes of the Egyptians were upon him, made an attempt to quit Egypt, he must then necessarily have been taken and treated as a deceiver. And during the time that the famine prevailed, it must necessarily strike every one, that as the whole business of the nation, in forming stores for the grain in every part of Egypt, daily pressed on him, had he been absent only for the time of a few months, an irreparable injury might have been occasioned.

Again, we cannot suppose that the Egyptian lords would allow him to quit the land: he had foretold the famine; Pharaoh and the lords believed him on the faith of what he had foretold concerning the chief butler and baker; but as the king had conferred the honour on him, it is reasonable to conclude that one condition was, that he was not to quit the land, as this might be considered a pretence to gain his liberty.

25 Now they ascended from Egypt, and entered the land of Canaan, to Jacob their father.

26 When they declared to him, saying, Joseph yet liveth; yea truly he ruleth over all the land of Egypt: then his heart fainted; for he believed them not.

27 Also they spake with him concerning all the words of Joseph, which he spake to them; when he had seen the carriages, which Joseph had sent, to carry him: then the spirit of Jacob their father revived.

28 Now Israel said; *It is enough, Joseph my son liveth; I will go, and I will see him, before I die.*

CHAP. XLVI.

NOW Israel departed with all that he had, and he came to Beer-sheba: where he offered sacrifices, before the God of his father Isaac.

2 Where God spake to Israel in the visions of the night; and he said, Jacob, Jacob: then he answered, Here *am I*.

3 And he said, *I am God, the God of thy father; fear thou not to go down to Egypt; for I will make thee there, a great nation.*

NOTES ON CHAP. XLVI.

1. *And came to Beer-sheba.* In this place we have found that the worship of God had been established ever since the time of Abraham, ch. xxi. 33; and as it was the order under that dispensation, so Jacob, as head of the church, here offered sacrifices. It will be well also to remember, that Jacob did not offer the sacrifices only in the presence of his own family, but also before the congregation of the people of Beer-sheba, who worshipped in this place. This must be evident, because the worship of God—the altar—the grove planted by Abraham—the house or tabernacle—and the Cherubim by which God communed with him—were in this place.

It has been said by some commentators, that Jacob at this place renewed his covenant with God: but this was not a renewal; it had been the public profession before the time of Abraham, even from Noah to Melchizedek, who was the king of Jerusalem, and a priest of God most high; and, as I have observed, had his tabernacle in Salem, i.e. the ancient name of Jerusalem. For the Psalmist, referring to this remote period, says, *Psa. lxx. 1, 2, In Salem also is (was) his tabernacle, and his dwelling-place in Zion;—lxxviii. 54, And he brought them to the border of his sanctuary, even to this mountain.* It proves that before the time of Moses, tabernacles had been erected; for it is absurd to suppose, that all the myriads of millions of true worshippers from Adam to Moses (a period of nearly 3000 years) had worshipped God in the open air; which some Jews as well as Christians, who have not referred to these proofs, have supposed.

The communication from above the Cherubim in the Holy

4 I will descend with thee into Egypt; yea I will also bring thee up: and Joseph shall put his hand, upon thine eyes.

5 So Jacob arose at Beer-sheba, whence the sons of Israel carried Jacob their father, with their little ones, and their wives; in the carriages which Pharaoh had sent to carry him.

6 Moreover they took their cattle, and their riches which they had gotten in the land of Canaan; and they came into Egypt: Jacob, and all his posterity with him.

7 His sons, and the sons of his sons with him; his daughters and the daughters of his sons, even all his posterity: he brought with him into Egypt.

8 ¶ Now these are the names of the children of Israel, who came into Egypt, Jacob and his sons: the firstborn Reuben.

9 And the sons of Reuben: Hanoth, and Phallu, and Hezron, and Carmi.

10 And the sons of Simeon, Jemuel, and Jamin, and Ohad, and Jachin, and Zohar: and Shaul, the son of a Canaanite.

11 And the sons of Levi: Gershon, Koath, and Merari.

12 And the sons of Judah: Er, and Onan, and Shelah, and Pharez, and Zerah: but Er and Onan died in the land of Canaan; and the sons of Pharez, were Hezron, and Hamul.

13 And the sons of Issachar: Tola, and Phuvah, and Job, and Shimron.

14 And the sons of Zebulun: Sered, and Elon, and Jahleel.

15 These were the sons of Leah, whom she bare unto Jacob in Padan of Aram; also with

Dinah his daughter: every soul his sons and his daughters, were thirty and three.

16 And the sons of Gad; Ziphion, and Haggai, Shuru, and Izbon: Eri, and Arodi, and Areli.

17 And the sons of Asher, Jimnah, and Ishaah, and Ishui, and Beriah, and Serah their sister: and the sons of Beriah; Heber, and Malchiel.

18 These were the sons of Zilpah; whom Laban gave to Leah his daughter: thus she bare unto Jacob; sixteen souls.

19 The sons of Rachel the wife of Jacob; Joseph, and Benjamin.

20 Now to Joseph were born in the land of Egypt; Ephraim and Manassch, whom Asenah, the daughter of Potipherah priest of On, bare to him:

21 And the sons of Benjamin, were Belah, and Becher, and Ashbel; Gera and Naaman, Ehi, and Rosh, Muppim, and Huppim, and Ard.

22 These were the sons of Rachel; who were born to Jacob: all the souls fourteen.

23 And the son of Dan, Hushim,
24 And the sons of Naphthali: Jaxeel, and Guni, and Jezer, and Shillem.

25 These were the sons of Bilhah; whom Laban gave to Rachel his daughter: thus she bare these to Jacob, all the souls seven.

26 All the souls who came with Jacob into Egypt, going forth from his loins; besides the wives of the sons of Jacob: all the souls, sixty and six.

27 But the sons of Joseph who were born

of Hoses is remarkable. In the 2d, 3d, and 4th verses he was informed, that God would be with him and his posterity, and that he would bring them up again. Therefore Jacob could with certainty say, ch. xlix. 1, *Gather yourselves together, that I may tell you that which shall befall you in the last days.*

7. *All his seed.* The word *zargno* reads, *all his posterity.*
10. *Son of a Canaanish woman.* Heb. *Son of a Canaanite.* There is no word for woman in the Hebrew: it was sufficient to be said, as it is said in the Hebrew, that Shaul the son of Simeon was the son of a Canaanite.

26. *All the souls were threescore and six.* Many have been the attempts to reconcile this with what is said by Stephen, Acts vii. 14, *threescore and fifteen souls*, who constituted the whole family of Jacob when he went into Egypt. And many writers, preferring the Greek, have supposed that the integrity of the Hebrew text might here be questioned. But it appears that Stephen gave the number of the family of Jacob when they were in Egypt; the Hebrew is more particular, for it is

there stated that sixty-six souls went with Jacob into Egypt, *who came from his loins*, which is true.

Jacob's eleven sons and one daughter	12
Reuben's sons	4
Simeon's sons	6
Levi's sons	3
Judah's three sons and two grandsons	5
Issachar's sons	4
Zebulun's sons	3
Gad's sons	7
Asher's four sons, one daughter, and two grandsons	7
Dan's son	1
Naphthali's sons	4
Benjamin's sons	10
	66

There certainly is no contradiction in these two accounts, for the wives of the sons of Jacob are not noticed in the

to him in Egypt, were two souls: all the souls of the house of Jacob who came into Egypt, were seventy.

28 Then he sent Judah before him, to Joseph, to direct his face to Goshen: and they entered the land of Goshen.

29 So Joseph girded his chariot, and he ascended to meet Israel his father, to Goshen: where he appeared before him, and he fell on his neck, and wept on his neck again.

30 Then Israel said to Joseph, Now I die: since I have seen thy face; truly thou yet livest.

31 Moreover Joseph said to his brethren, and to the house of his father; I will go, and inform Pharaoh, and say to him; My brethren and the house of my father, who were in the land of Canaan, are come to me.

32 Now the men are feeders of a flock, truly they have been directors of cattle: and their

the Hebrew; it is with truth said, those who come from his loins. Of the wives of his sons there appear to be but nine; the wife of Judah, ch. xxxviii. 12, and the wife of Simcon, ver. 10, were dead, and the wife of Joseph was in Egypt: so that these nine, who went with his sons, grandsons, and granddaughters, made the number seventy-five who went with him, according to the New Testament.

Another difficulty arises from the 27th verse, where it is said, *all the souls of the house of Jacob who came into Egypt were threescore and ten*. This statement is also right. It is said the house of Jacob, viz. those related to him by blood; and here Jacob, Joseph, and his two sons, make the number seventy. So that Stephen mentions those who went with him into Egypt, including their wives; Jacob, the sixty-six relatives by consanguinity who went with him, beside the four who made the number seventy of his own relations by blood, when in Egypt.

28. Came unto. There is no word in the original for unto; יָבֹאוּ *yabau*, reads they entered, see Josh. viii. 19.

The land of Goshen appears to have been the most fertile land in all Egypt; a vast plain which was near the great river of Egypt. For we find that Moses was put into an ark to float on this river, and this will account for its wonderful fertility. In Goshen was a principal city, which was called Ramesses; and in the time of the Ptolemies, Ἡλιούπολις, Heliopolis, the city of the sun, or the city nearer to the rising of the sun than any other of the cities of Egypt.

34. For every shepherd is an abomination unto the Egyptians. This must strike the reader with a manifest inconsistency; the Egyptians must have had great numbers of shepherds among themselves, for Pharaoh desired that some of the brethren of Joseph should be made rulers over his cattle, ch. xlvii. 6. This will appear still stronger when we consider that Egypt had been the granary of the East for many years. The word חֲבוּר *thognabath*, is rendered an abomination; but this word is too strong, for the reason above assigned, viz. that their own people, who were shepherds, could not be an abomination to them. At this period all other nations appeared to serve Egypt: they had, on account of the riches pouring into

flocks, and their herds, and all that is theirs, they have brought.

33 So it shall be when Pharaoh shall call for you, and shall say, What is your occupation?

34 Then ye shall say, Thy servants have been directors of cattle from our youth even till now; both we, also our fathers: then ye shall dwell in the land of Goshen; for every feeder of a flock, is disregarded by the Egyptians.

CHAP. XLVII.

THEN Joseph went, and informed Pharaoh; and he said, My father, and my brethren with their flocks, and their herds, yea all that they have, are come from the land of Canaan: and behold, they are in the land of Goshen.

2 Also for this end he took of his brethren, five men; and he presented them, in the presence of Pharaoh.

their land to buy corn, become the most affluent of all the nations; the government, the nobles, and the great men, had become proud with their prosperity and riches, and considered the breeding and selling of flocks as far beneath them: so that legislative idleness had led them to imperious dominion, and they held the lower orders of the people, who followed this useful employment among themselves, in a contemptuous light. These were they who were considered of little account; but they were no more an abomination to them, than the shepherds or feeders of herds are an abomination to the nations of Europe at this day; who, compared with the great body of the nobles, gentry, merchants, statesmen, philosophers, and rich mechanics, are lightly esteemed, because their habits of life do not lead them to the investigation of such subjects as are pursued by those who are esteemed learned and intelligent. I therefore have made choice of the word *disregarded*, as being more consistent with the obvious meaning of the original word, and with the intention of the sacred writer.

The words נֹטֵר נֹטֵר *rogueek tsuan*, are rendered only by the word *shepherd*. But *rogueek*, means a feeder, and *tsuan*, sheep; viz. a feeder of sheep. We also here may remark the wisdom of the request to Pharaoh, that he would suffer them to dwell in the land of Goshen; for by dwelling together they were thus enabled to establish the true worship of God, to preserve themselves as a people, to become a nation, and, finally, under God, to be delivered from their oppressors.

NOTES ON CHAP. XLVII.

2. And he took some of his brethren. Various attempts have been made to ascertain which of the brethren Joseph took to present to Pharaoh. Some writers, in endeavouring to give the meaning of the word מִקְטֹרֶחַ *mikturach*, rendered by some, have said, 1st, "he took the first that came to hand;" 2nd, "of the meanest looking;" 3rd, "the best made and finest looking;" 4th, "five of the eldest;" 5th, "some of the eldest, and some of the youngest." But the word *mikturach*, means the end, the extremity, the last; and, agreeably to our idiom, it would mean the last born, or the youngest. It is not likely that Joseph would take the eldest before Pharaoh. Nor is it at

3 Then Pharaoh said to his brethren; What is your occupation? and they said to Pharaoh, Thy servants feed the flock; both we, also our fathers.

4 Moreover they said to Pharaoh, To sojourn in the land, we come; truly there is no pasturage for the flock, before thy servants; because of the grievous famine in the land of Canaan: therefore now I pray thee shall thy servants dwell, on land like Goshen?

5 Then Pharaoh spake to Joseph saying: Thy father and thy brethren are come to thee;

6 The land of Egypt is before thy face, on the best of the land, cause thou thy father, and thy brethren to dwell: they shall dwell in the land of Goshen, and if thou knowest that there be among them, men of ability; then make them rulers over cattle for me.

7 So Joseph brought Jacob his father, and he caused him to stand in the presence of Pharaoh: then Jacob blessed Pharaoh.

8 And Pharaoh said to Jacob: How many are the days of the years of thy life?

9 Then Jacob said to Pharaoh; The days of the years of my sojourning, a hundred and thirty years: few and grievous have been the days of the years of my life; and have not attained to the days of the years, of the life of my fathers, in the days of their sojournings.

10 Again, Jacob blessed Pharaoh: then he went forth from before the presence of Pharaoh.

11 Now Joseph dwelt with his father and with his brethren; for he had delivered to them a

possession in the land of Egypt; in the best of the land, in the land of Rameses: accordingly as Pharaoh had commanded.

12 Thus Joseph provided for his father and for his brethren; also for all the house of his father: bread according to their families.

13 There was no bread in all the land, for the famine was exceedingly grievous: yea the land of Egypt, and the land of Canaan fainted, before the face of the famine.

14 Then Joseph collected all the money that was found in the land of Egypt, and in the land of Canaan, for corn which they bought: and Joseph brought the money, into the house of Pharaoh.

15 When the money failed in the land of Egypt, and in the land of Canaan; then all the Egyptians came to Joseph saying, Give to us bread; for why must we die before thee because the money faileth?

16 Then Joseph said, Give ye your cattle, and I will give to you for your cattle, if money faileth.

17 So they brought their cattle to Joseph: then Joseph gave bread to them for horses, and for cattle of the flock, also for the cattle of the herd, and for asses: so he fed them with bread for all their cattle, that year.

18 When that year ended, then they came to him in the second year, and said to him, We will not conceal from my lord, for whereas the money is spent, and the herds of cattle belong

all probable, if this had been the case, that he would have said to Joseph, ver. 6, and if thou knowest men of activity among them, then make them rulers over my cattle; if he had presented the eldest of his brethren, for Reuben was at this time near sixty years old, and therefore not fit for much activity.

Over my cattle. מִנְּכִי Mikneh, also means property, as well as cattle. Here again we find that Joseph did not put his brethren in a situation to be despised, consequently they were not an abomination to the Egyptians. It cannot be allowed that the brethren of the first man in Egypt next to the king, should be employed in any thing which would have been thought by the nobles of Egypt abominable.

8. How old art thou? Heb. How many are the days of the years of thy life?

9. Of my pilgrimage. The word pilgrim comes from the French word *pelerin*, an alien, a stranger, or corrupted from the Latin word *peregrinus*. Heb. Of my sojourning.

13. And there was no bread in all the land. But this, we are told by objectors, is a manifest contradiction to the following part of the chapter; for it is expressly said in the 17th verse, and he fed them with bread for that year. Also in the 18th and 9th verses, When that year was ended, they came unto him

the second year—Buy us and our land for bread. From which it appears that there must be an error in the common translation of this verse.

וְכִי עָלָה לֶחֶם עֵינָי is rendered, and there was no bread. The words *there was*, are supplied; and וְכִי עָלָה, rendered *no*, should be translated as it is in Isa. xlv. 12, to fail. The clause will then truly read, Now bread failed in all the land. That is, a scarcity prevailed.

18. They came unto him the second year. Six years of the famine had elapsed; they had given their money and their cattle for food; and when this was ended, they came to Joseph the second time, called here the second year, the last of the famine.

How that our money is spent. As it is said in the 15th verse, that the money was spent, it could not be here repeated by way of informing Joseph that it was so; as it is unnecessarily said in the common version. The people informed him, that as he knew the money was spent, and the cattle had become Pharaoh's, that they had now nothing left but their land and their persons.

19. Buy us and our land. This must appear to be a wrong translation. Joseph did not buy their persons; there was no

my lord: nothing is left before the face of my lord, except our persons, and our lands;

19 Why must we perish in thy sight, both we, and also our land? buy of us even the substance of our land, for bread: then we for our land, will be servants to Pharaoh; also give seed, which shall be sustenance, and we shall not die; then shall the land not be desolate.

20 Thus Joseph bought the substance of all the land of Egypt for Pharaoh; for the Egyptians delivered every one his field, because the famine prevailed against them: and the land was to remain with Pharaoh.

21 Then he caused the people to pass before him, to the cities: from one end of the border of Egypt, even to the other end thereof.

22 Only the land of the priests, he bought not: for the priests had a decree from Pharaoh, and they ate their portion, which Pharaoh gave

to them; wherefore they sold no substance of their lands.

23 Then Joseph said to the people; Behold, I have bought of you this day, even the substance of your land for Pharaoh; see here is seed for you; now ye shall sow the land;

24 And it shall be, in the increase, that ye shall give fifts to Pharaoh: then four parts shall be your own for seed of the field, and for your food, also for them of your houses, even for food for your families.

25 Then they said, Thou hast preserved us: we shall find favour in the sight of my lord, therefore we will be servants to Pharaoh.

26 So Joseph made it a statute to this day, over the land of Egypt, for a fifth for Pharaoh: except the land of the priests only; it was not for Pharaoh.

27 Thus Israel dwelt in the land of Egypt,

necessity to purchase the people, so long as they had property in land. קנינו אתם ואת אדמתם *Keneth othaanou veeth admaathee* now, is in the common version rendered, *Buy us and our land*. *Othaanou*, means truly of us. It is a compound word from *u* us, and the particle *eth*, which has the signification of many propositions: see Gen. xxiv. 55, where this compound word is properly rendered *with us*;—xxiv. 10; 1 Sam. ix. 7; upon us, Psa. lxxvii. 1; Gen. xlii. 30, *on us*, to us; and *eth*, which is omitted in the common version, means the substance, the produce, viz. *veeth admaathee*, even the substance of our land. And agreeably to this request we find in the 26th verse, that this substance of their land, which they were to give for ever as the purchase of their lands, was one fifth of the produce.

And we and our land will be servants to Pharaoh. It is also proper to remark here, that the *vau*, prefixed to *admaathee*, viz. *and our land*, cannot be rendered by the copulative conjunction *and*, but by *for*; when the sense is conducive to, or beneficial to, says Tillotson, which is the case in the passage before us, as it is in Jer. xvii. 8; ומה *ve mahad*, for he shall be; Isa. iii. 7, ומה *ve mahad* in my house. The passage truly reads, then we for our land will be servants to Pharaoh. Which is in conformity with the following verse, where it is said that Joseph only bought this part of the produce of their land.

20. And so the land became Pharaoh's. That is, the land became a security to Pharaoh for the payment of the fifth of the produce. This was a land tax, which paid according to the increase or decrease of the produce; so that in fact the land itself belonged to the people, they had no other rent to pay, except this part of the produce. And this, with the crown land, defrayed the whole of their expenses for the support of religion and the government. An account of the ancient constitution of Egypt may be seen in Diodorus Siculus, lib. 1. He says the land was divided; one part was appropriated to the use of the priesthood, who provided all the sacrifices, and defrayed all the expenses of the public worship; the second part belonged to the state, to support the monarchy, and to pay the expenses arising from wars; the third part of the

land belonged to the people, who were thus servants, or soldiers, who held themselves in readiness to serve in defense of their country and their property.

22. The land of the priests he bought not. Hence it appears that the religion of Egypt was established by law, and that a certain portion of the produce of the land was given to support the religion and government of the country. This is not the earliest account of an established religion, we find that Abraham gave the tenth to Melchizedek, priest of the most high God, ch. xiv. 20; also xxviii. 22, Jacob gave the tenth toward the support of public worship.

23. I have bought you this day, and your lands. The word *keneth*, is rendered by you; but this word as well as *othaanou*, ver. 19, is a compound word of *ken*, you, and *eth*, a particle signifying any case; and yet the word *eth*, has been omitted by the translators in all the versions, notwithstanding the true meaning and application of the passage cannot be had, unless the whole word be translated: see Exod. iii. 16; Gen. ix. 10, 12; Lev. xix. 34; Numb. i. 4, 5; Josh. xxiv. 8; Jer. ii. 9; Ezek. xx. 36, &c. of. It reads, I have bought of you, and when the *eth* is translated, which means substance, and the *vau*, which is omitted, the clause reads, I have bought of you this day, even of the substance of your land. For it is evident as above, that he did not buy their persons, neither did he buy their lands, but only the fifth part of their produce, for which they were all supported in this last year of the famine; and he gave them seed to sow their lands, which did not pass from them. From which it is evident that no argument can be brought from scripture for the continuance of that infamous traffic the slave trade, as has been attempted by those who live by the robbery and sale of their fellow men. The nation that abolishes it must have been moved by a superior power: England is the first that has set the example. But why are those already in slavery, to continue in slavery?

25. Let us find favour. They had already found favour, they had obtained corn for the year, and seed to sow their lands. There is no authority for the word *let*, and *rimtsa*, is the first person plural.

in the land of Goshen: for they had possessions therein; there they brought forth, and multiplied exceedingly.

28 Moreover Jacob lived in the land of Egypt, seventeen years: so the age of Jacob was, an hundred forty and seven years.

29 Now the time of the death of Israel, drew nigh; so he called for his son, for Joseph, and said to him, If now I have found favour in thy sight; put now thy hand, under my loin, and deal with me kindly and truly; now thou shalt not bury me in Egypt.

30 For I will lie with my fathers, there thou shalt carry me from Egypt; yea thou shalt bury me in their sepulchre: and he said, I will do as thou hast spoken.

31 Then he said, Swear before me; and he swore before him: so Israel bowed himself upon the head of the bed.

26. *Except the land of the priests only.* There is a very improper repetition here, viz. *except* and *only*; one of these words must be unnecessary; accordingly we find no authority for it in the original. This portion of the land was not for Pharaoh, therefore there was no propriety in making the word *only*, a part of the text. *לִבְדָּאֵם*, *le baddaam*, literally means *for themselves*.

NOTES ON CHAP. XLVIII.

1. *Now it came to pass after these things.* The word *דְּבָאֵרִים* *debaarim*, when applied to conversation, literally means *words*: and the first clause reads, *Now it was after these words*, viz. after the conversation that had just taken place between Joseph and his father, in the last verses of the preceding chapter.

A reference to the 28th verse of the last chapter will shew, that Jacob was now near the time of his death. In the following verse, the 29th, Jacob called for Joseph; and after his solemn oath to his father in the last verse of the preceding chapter, while the conversation was still going on, this chapter begins thus, *Now it was after these words*.

That one told Joseph. In these four words we have the word *one*, for which there is no authority in the original, and it also perverts the application. In the common version it appears, that at a remote period, some person told Joseph that his father was sick; whereas the verb *וַיֹּמֶר* *va yomer*, is the third person singular preter, viz. *he said*, which with the *ו* *vau* prefixed, reads, *that he said*, viz. *Now it was after these words that he said to Joseph*. In the translation of this last word *וַיֹּמֶר* *Joseph*, the *ו* *lamed* prefixed to it, is omitted in the common version; but here it has its true reading, viz. *to Joseph*. So that, instead of *one* telling Joseph that his father was sick, it was Jacob himself who spake to Joseph after the former conversation, in the third person, which is customary in all languages.

Thy father is sick, *חֹלֶה* *choleh*, is rendered by *sick*; but as Jacob was able to converse with Joseph and his brethren, and to open the scenes of futurity to his posterity; the word *sick* is too strong. I therefore translate it as it is in other parts of

NOW it was after these words, that he said to Joseph; Behold thy father is infirm: so he brought his two sons with him; Manasseh and Ephraim.

2 Which he certified to Jacob, when he said, Behold thy son Joseph, cometh to thee: therefore Israel strengthened himself, and he sat upon the bed.

3 Then Jacob said to Joseph; GOD ALMIGHTY appeared to me at Luz, in the land of Canaan: yea he blessed me.

4 Then he said to me, Behold I will make thee fruitful, and multiply thee; yea I will make of thee a multitude of people: moreover I will give this land after thee to thy posterity, an everlasting possession.

5 Now therefore, thy two sons, who were born to thee in the land of Egypt, when I came

scripture, by *weak*, *infirm*, Prov. xviii. 14; Isa. xiv. 10. In other respects, this clause is rightly translated; but the application is wrong, for it is Jacob himself, at the close of the conversation concerning his being buried with his fathers, who says to Joseph, *thy father is infirm*.

And he took with him his two sons. Agreeably to the idiom, the verb *וַיִּקַּח* *yikach*, rendered *he took*, should be translated as it is in Numbers xxiii. 18, *he brought*, which then reads, *and he brought with him his two sons*.

2. *And one told Jacob.* The same error is made here as in the preceding verse, for the verb *וַיֹּמֶר* *yagvel* is the third person singular preter of the verb, with the *ו* *vau* prefixed; and as the subject refers to something prior, it should be rendered as it is in Esth. ii. 22, *which he certified*, viz. *And he brought with him his two sons, Manasseh and Ephraim, which he certified to Jacob*.

Again it appears, that the word *one*, mentioned in the common version of this verse, which is not in the original, who is said to have told Jacob, is also made to say, *Behold thy son Joseph cometh unto thee*. But it evidently was Joseph who certified to Jacob, that he had brought his two sons Manasseh and Ephraim. The proposition ends at the word *Jacob*, as is signified by the *Katon* over the word, viz. *which he certified to Jacob*; and the first word of the second proposition *וַיֹּמֶר* *va yomer*, then he said, is perfectly consistent with the syntax of the language, as well as the true meaning and application of the verbs, without the addition of any word to make out a sense, as in the common version. It truly reads, *which he certified to Jacob, then he said, Behold thy son Joseph cometh to thee*.

3. *God Almighty appeared unto me at Luz.* Jacob then addresses Joseph by the words *אֱלֹהֵי שְׁדָא* *El shadda*, *God the pourer forth*, viz. of all good. This communication to Jacob was in the ordained way of the divine communication from above the Cherubim, at the place where the public worship of God was established at Luz; but afterward, this place was called *Beth-el*, or *the house of God*. Hence we find, that before the time of Jacob there was at Luz a temple for the public worship of God.

to thee into Egypt, they *are* mine: Ephraim and Manasseh; as Reuben and Simcon, they shall be mine.

6 But thy offspring which are born after them, shall be thine: they shall be called after the name of their brethren, in their inheritance.

7 With me on my coming from Padan, Rachel died before me, in the land of Canaan, on the journey; when yet but a short distance of land, in coming to Ephrath: and I buried her there, on the journey to Ephrath; the same is Beth-lehem.

8 Thus Israel considered the sons of Joseph: and he said, Whose *are* these?

9 And Joseph said to his father; They are my sons, whom God hath given to me in this place: then he said, Bring them now before me, for I will bless them.

10 For the eyes of Israel were dim with age, he could not distinguish: then he approached with them before him, and he kissed them, and embraced them.

11 And Israel said to Joseph; Thy face I

7. *As for me.* The word *וָאֲנִי* *va ani*, is translated *as for me*; but it conveys no sense applicable to the circumstance of going to Ephrath, or of his coming from Padan. Heb. *With me.*

8 and 10. These two verses in the common version plainly contradict each other. In the 8th verse it is said, *and Israel beheld Joseph's sons*; in the 10th verse, *Now the eyes of Israel were dim for age, so that he could not see*; but there is no contradiction in the Hebrew. Besides, objectors say, "if Jacob had beheld them, he must have known them, as they were born to Joseph before Jacob went into Egypt; and there would have been no necessity for him to have said, when he beheld them with Joseph, *Who are these?*"

The words *וַיִּבְרַח* *va yare* Israel, are rendered *and Israel beheld*; *וַיִּבְרַח* *va yare*, agreeably to the idiom, as is the case in all languages, means *to consider*, Eccl. iv. 15; *experience*, ch. i. 16; *approve*, Lam. iii. 36; *to regard*, Psalm cvi. 44. Therefore I translate it as the same word is translated in this psalm, *he regarded*. Which, with the *נָא* *eth* following, but not noticed in the common version, will then read, *Now Israel regarded the sons of Joseph, and he said, Who are these?*

10. *Dim for age.* Heb. *Dim with age.* Could not see. Heb. *Could not distinguish.*

12. *From between his knees.* Heb. *Even before his knees*, for the sons of Joseph were now about twenty years old.

63. *And he brought them near unto him.* This is incorrect; the words *near* and *them*, are expletive; there is not any authority for them in the original. Besides, as the sacred writer had made this remark in the 10th verse, there was no necessity for him to repeat it in this verse. Though such repetitions may be allowed in modern writings, they are not to be found in the original scripture, which, as to composition, is a standard of perfection. The sacred writer here describes the manner of Joseph's coming with his sons before his father, therefore the *וָאֲנִי*, rendered by *and*, viz. *and brought*, should be

expected not to see: but behold, God hath shewn to me thy posterity.

12 Thus Joseph brought them forth even before his knees: and he bowed himself with his face to the earth.

13 Then Joseph took both of them; Ephraim on his right towards the left of Israel; but with Manasseh on his left towards the right of Israel; when he approached before him.

14 Now Israel stretched out his right hand, which he put on the head of Ephraim, even the younger; and his left, on the head of Manasseh, wisely with his hands; for Manasseh was the first-born.

15 Then he blessed Joseph, and said; The God, before whom my fathers, Abraham and Isaac walked; the God who feedeth me, even continually to this day;

16 The messenger who delivered me from all harm, he will bless the youths; yea he will call them by my name; even the name of my fathers, Abraham and Isaac: and they will increase to a multitude, in the midst of the earth.

rendered *when he brought*. It is proper to observe, that this blessing was not, as is supposed, a common expression of good will; it was now the time for the confirmation of the priesthood on Joseph, and therefore, in the presence of his sons, Jacob used the customary rite in passing over the sacred office to his successors, which is meant by his blessing them, that after his decease there might be no claim set up, either by Reuben or his posterity.

15. *All my life long*—is an expression that degrades the scripture. It is obvious, that the word *long* is unnecessary: had the translators rendered it *all my life*, it would have been good language; and even then the translation would be incorrect, for the word *הָרַחֵק* *harogeh* is participial, viz. *feedeth*; see Cant. ii. 16;—ch. vi. 8; Gen. xxxvii. 2. The words *all my life long*, have no authority in the original; *וְעַד מְעֵינָדִי* *meenadi*, is thus translated: but *וְעַד* *godi*, means the constant support, or continuance of a thing, Job xxix. 11; Lam. ii. 13; Gen. xxix. 7. It is *yet high day*, viz. *it continueth*.

16. *The angel which redeemed me from all evil.* Many have been the conjectures concerning this angel; most commentators have concluded that he was the Christian Redeemer. That he was not the person of the Christian Redeemer, must be obvious, if we attend to the fact contained in the narrative. The words *הַמַּלְאָכִים הַזֵּהִם* *ha mal'ake ha goel othi*, rendered *the angel which redeemed me*, literally mean, *the messenger who delivered me*. Jacob here speaks of a time when he was in great trouble, and if we refer to ch. xxxii. we shall find who this messenger was, as well as the cause of his trouble. The first verse says, *the angels of God (messengers) met him*; the 7th verse, *Jacob was greatly afraid and distressed*; the 23d verse, *Jacob had sent messengers before him to Esau, lest he should smite him*; and, finally, it is expressly said, verse 24, that it was a *man* who wrestled with him, viz. *and there wrestled a man with him*.

17 When Joseph saw that his father laid his right hand upon the head of Ephraim, then it was grievous in his sight: and he took hold of the hand of his father, to remove it from off the head of Ephraim, to the head of Manassch;

18 And Joseph said to his father, Not so my father, because this is the first-born; put thy right upon the head of him.

This man was the angel or messenger (for that is the meaning of the word) from Edom; the supreme ecclesiastical judge who blessed him and delivered him, for that is the meaning of *למנוח* *ha goel*, to deliver, redeem, retrieve, vindicate; *Psa. cxix. 154, deliver me*; to deliver from the avenger, *Numb. xxxv. 12*; *Josh. xx. 9*.

From all evil. This is indefinite; the sacred writer did not apply this in the way that it has been understood by those who have not only supposed that it referred to the Redeemer; but also that Jacob, on account of ultimately prevailing with the person he contended with, was redeemed from all evil. The word *מכל* *raang*, means harm, adversity, mischief, all which bring what we call evil. Thus it is here applied to the man who was deputed on the part of Esau to inquire into the nature of the claim of Jacob; see *ch. xxxii. 24 to 29*. He justified him before Esau, and thus he saved him from the harm he expected, to whom he here refers. These persons, who under this dispensation received the commands of God, had the power of settling all matters, and their decision was accompanied in the customary way by a blessing, if approved; which is here called a redemption. But in no part of scripture is it said in the original, that an angel, or an immaterial being from heaven, ever conversed face to face with a mortal man. Neither is there any authority to support the notion that it was the person of the Redeemer; for the history contains the fact concerning the redemption of Jacob by the messenger from Esau, who is said to have been literally a man. The commentators universally have erred here; they have lost sight of this one great truth, that in the dispensation before the Christian, every religious rite, as well as the office of the priesthood, was representative of Messiah the Redeemer. Therefore that Jacob believed what he preached, viz. the divine efficacy of that redemption which was to be accomplished at his coming, is evident; and now he confirmed the priesthood on Joseph.

17 to 20. It will be remembered that Reuben, the oldest of the two firstborn, was to have succeeded to the priesthood; but on account of his deflection he forfeited that right, and the priesthood passed over to Joseph, who was the firstborn of Rachel, and so to his posterity. In his line it was 160 years before the establishment of the Levitical priesthood in the line of Aaron; so that, after Joseph, Jacob confirmed this succession on Ephraim. It is also worthy of remark, that where these two sons of Joseph are mentioned before this period, Manassch is always put before Ephraim; but when Jacob here confirms the priesthood on Ephraim, then Ephraim is put before Manassch.

This is a singularity concerning which commentators have given many opinions; but I have not met with any writer who has satisfied me on the subject: I shall therefore communicate what I think to be satisfactory. It will have the sanction of scripture custom always observed in the churches before this period, and even to the end of the theocracy under the renewal of the dispensation given to Moses.

19 Notwithstanding his father refused, for he said, I know my son, I know; he also will become even a people, yea moreover he will be great: but truly his younger brother will be greater than him; for his posterity will become a multitude of nations.

20 Thus he blessed them that day, declaring; By thee, will Israel bless, saying; God will

I have before observed, that in all the churches from the fall to the end of the theocracy, every rite, ceremony, and ordinance, was understood by these ancient people to signify the certain fulfilment of the promise of the coming of the Messiah. And thus, that the office of the patriarch or father, who was the head of his civil and ecclesiastical department, represented the kingly and priestly offices of the Messiah; concerning whom it is said, *the government shall be upon his shoulders*. He was a patriarchal king; for of this order of government it is said, that Melchizedek was king of Salem, and priest of the most high God. Therefore, as the divine communication was always given to the officiating patriarch in his tabernacle where he resided, not only concerning things appertaining to religion, but also to things of a political nature, it at once will account for that pre-eminence which was always given to those who succeeded to the priesthood.

20. *In thee shall Israel bless*. I laboured long to comprehend the meaning of this passage in the common version, but could not understand how Israel was to bless, or to whom the patriarch was speaking. Commentators in general have passed this over, and those who have attempted to form some opinion concerning it have said, that in "future generations the Israelites were to take their form of wishing prosperity to any nation or family, from the circumstance of the good which it shall be known that God has done to Ephraim and Manassch." But it does not appear that any more good was done to Ephraim or Manassch than to the other tribes. If these commentators mean us to understand as they say, that the meaning is, "May God make thee as fruitful as Ephraim, and multiply thee as Manassch," though there is no distinction between the words *fruitful* and *multiply*, a reference to the history will shew that this cannot be the meaning. For as to the numbers of Ephraim or of Manassch, they were far under the other tribes; and, if taken together, they do not amount to the number of the tribe of Judah. So that the commentators who have supposed that the sacred writer meant to communicate this as a reference which the patriarch made to the *fruitfulness* of Ephraim, and the *multiplication* of Manassch, which was to be the "form of wishing prosperity to the future generations of the Israelites, or of other nations," do not appear to have comprehended the meaning of this important passage.

The reader will observe that in the 15th verse, Jacob begins with the blessing of Joseph, viz. *And he blessed Joseph*; that was, confirming on him and on his posterity the succession to the priesthood. But at the end of the 16th verse, being interrupted by Joseph, who supposed that he had erred in acknowledging the one who was to succeed him, the patriarch makes a digression to inform him that Ephraim should be greater than Manassch; so that from the beginning of the 17th to the end of the 19th verse is a parenthesis. He then resumes the subject of the blessing of Joseph, and he says, *ישראל בק יברך* *beha yebareek Israel*.

direct thee concerning Ephraim, and concerning Manasseh: so he put Ephraim, before Manasseh.

The word *ya beka*, which is translated in *thee*, is evidently wrong, because we cannot suppose that Israel was to bless in Joseph; it is a compound certainly, but it requires to be translated in conformity to the sense of the narrative, and to the subject to which it is applied, viz. the priesthood which was established by Jacob on Joseph. The *beth*, therefore, should be translated as it is in other parts of scripture, by the word *by*, as it relates to the descent of the priesthood from Jacob to Joseph and his posterity; *ya beka*, will then properly read *by thee*. Now instead of this passage having any relation to the form of blessing which the Israelitish nation was to adopt, "because of the good which was to be done to Ephraim and Manasseh," it was evidently applied to Joseph. It will be remembered, that when the name of Jacob was changed, on his return from Padan, at which period he was received as the representative head of the whole church, it is said, ch. xxxii. 28, *Thy name shall be called no more Jacob, but ISRAEL*. And in the 2d verse of chap. xlix. he says, *Hearken unto ISRAEL your father*; so that in the verse under consideration the patriarch does not refer to the nation of Israel, but to the man by whom and by whose posterity the priesthood was to descend, to the end of that order, at the establishment of the Levitical priesthood. The clause reads—*by thee (Joseph) shall Israel (Jacob) bless*; viz. by Joseph and his posterity, who were here acknowledged as successors to the priesthood; *shall Israel bless*. It is so said, because the church was now established under him, and the divine communication was to be received by the posterity of Joseph, and by them given to the people.

Thus the passage, agreeably to the syntax of the Hebrew, reads consistently; but in the common version, the clause, *in thee shall Israel bless*, cannot be understood; it has no application. If the reader attends to the history, he will find that it was not Israel, or the nation of Israel, who blessed the people; for it then would have been, that the people blessed the people. But it was always those who filled the office of the priesthood who blessed the people; Num. vi. 23, *Speak unto Aaron and unto his sons, saying, On this wise ye shall bless the children of Israel, saying unto them, the Lord bless thee, and keep thee: the Lord make his face shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee: the Lord lift his countenance upon thee, and give thee peace*.

God make thee as Ephraim and as Manasseh. Thus the second division of the major proposition, is as unintelligible as the first; for as the word *thee* cannot be applied by future generations in the form of wishing prosperity to a nation, by their being made like Ephraim and Manasseh; neither can it be applied to Ephraim and Manasseh, or to Joseph, as making him like Ephraim and Manasseh.

Jacob having now acknowledged Joseph to be the successor, proceeds to satisfy him respecting the future disposal of Ephraim and Manasseh. The word *ya yesimka*, is in the common version translated, *make thee*, viz. *God make thee*. But as it was not applied to Ephraim, and as in the common version the word *make* cannot be understood to be applied to Joseph, it is positive evidence that the common version must be wrong.

This word *ya yesimka*, rendered *make thee*, must necessarily, for the above reasons, have a different reading, in conformity with its radical meaning. Thus it has various readings according to construction and idiom; as, *sit, ordain, appoint,*

21 Then Israel said, to Joseph; Behold I die: nevertheless God will be with you; and return with you, to the land of your fathers;

settle, determine, put, make, Exod. iv. 15; Hab. i. 12; Prov. viii. 29; Dan. i. 6; 2 Sam. xiii. 32; Job xxxiv. 14, *to dispose*; Ezra. viii. 17, *I told them, determined, direct*, which last word conveys the meaning of the sacred writer, as is plain from the whole narrative. This will shew that the venerable patriarch fully satisfied Joseph respecting this very singular direction, for the adoption of Ephraim instead of Manasseh. It reads, *God will direct thee*.

The last remark I shall make on this passage, is on the *caph*, prefixed to the words *עפראים Ephraim*, and *מנשה Manasseh*; which in the common version is rendered by a particle of likeness, as. But this cannot be, for the patriarch could not say to Joseph, *God make thee like Ephraim and like Manasseh*, as observed; therefore the translators should have chosen a proper word in conformity with the sense of the original, as they have necessarily so done in other parts of scripture, where this particle is properly so translated. See Gen. xxxix. 11; 1 Sam. xxv. 38, *about or concerning*. The clause reads, *concerning Ephraim and Manasseh*.

If we even take the numbers of the camps of the Hebrews, we shall find that the camp of Ephraim was not so numerous as the others; it was less than the least of the others by near forty thousand, while the camp of Judah nearly doubled the number of Ephraim. So that, whether we take Ephraim and Manasseh together or separate, there was nothing in them, so far, to authorise the setting them up as having something more worthy of imitation than the other tribes, to induce the Hebrews, "in future generations, to take their form of blessing from the good that should be done to them." Again, if we follow the tribe of Ephraim during their exercise of the priesthood in Egypt, to their deliverance; when the sacred office was taken from them, there does not appear to have been any moral fitness in them, more than in the other tribes, to authorise a conclusion of this kind. For it appears, that at the time of the Exodus the people were so infatuated with the idolatry of Egypt, that they attributed their deliverance to the idol they had set up, the principal idol of Egypt; and which could not have been the case had not the priesthood, the descendants of Joseph, relaxed in their duty, as has been too frequently the case. Thus they countenanced the fashionable abomination of the day: they saw no harm in bowing the knee to an image, as representative of the perfections of God. Consequently, there was not any thing in them worthy of admiration or imitation, more than the other tribes, to induce future generations to adopt a form of blessing in wishing prosperity to any nation by saying, *God make thee as Ephraim and Manasseh*.

22. *I have given to thee one portion above thy brethren*. This passage has been involved in darkness by all translators and commentators for 1600 years, as is evident from this consideration; that neither the *portion* given to Joseph, nor the application of the last clause concerning *the sword and the bow*, have been understood. Therefore in all the translations, we remain in total ignorance, as to the meaning of the sacred writer, to the present day.

Some have said, that as the word *שכם Shechem* occurs here, Jacob gave to Joseph the field he purchased of Shechem the Amorite, in the land of Canaan. Nothing can be more contrary to truth than such a conclusion. Jacob and his family were now settled in Egypt, where the posterity of Joseph remained with the descendants of his brethren near 200 years.

22 Thus I have given to thee, one portion, above thy brethren : which I secured from the power of the Amorite ; with my sword, and with my bow.

CHAP. XLIX.

¶ **T**HEN Jacob called to his sons : and he said, Assemble ye, for I will tell to you,

Joseph was also, at this period, the greatest and the richest subject in the kingdom, and therefore the simple acquisition of a field in a foreign land, had Jacob had it in his power to have given it to him, would not have been worth his acceptance. Now as this could not be the portion which Jacob gave to Joseph, it not being of any consequence to raise him above his brethren, we must look for something of a more interesting nature, and which may be confirmed by scripture, as applicable to Joseph in raising him above his brethren.

If the reader will turn over the pages of commentators, he will find, that to the present day they say, in the language of a modern commentator, " many attempts have been made to explain this abstruse verse, but they have all hitherto been fruitless." I say, in reply to such injudicious conclusions, that these writers had better have been silent on the subject, than to have, in effect, informed us that God has given any part of his word which is impossible to be understood. When the descent of the divine order is known, there is nothing abstruse in this verse, or in any other part of scripture.

I have before shewn that the priesthood of Jacob was confirmed on Joseph on the defection of Reuben, when Jacob made for him the coat of supplication, ch. xxxvii. 3. And in the 20th verse of this chapter, he also, by divine direction, assigns the priesthood to Ephraim, who was to succeed Joseph. From which it is obvious, that the subject mentioned in these three verses is respecting the priesthood of Jacob, which was confirmed on Joseph and Ephraim by Jacob. And therefore, with reference to the priesthood which he had confirmed on Joseph, and which he had exercised all the time he had been in Egypt, he said, *I have given thee one portion above thy brethren.* This is abundantly evident from the 20th verse, when Jacob confirmed the priesthood on Joseph, to descend by the line of Ephraim. It is there said, *by thee shall Israel bless ; that is, the descendants of Joseph by the line of Ephraim, were to have the priesthood ; they were in their priestly office to be the blessers of Israel, as above.* Thus, then, we have the solution of this passage, which by commentators has been called *abstruse*. The reason is plain ; they have not even suspected that there was any order of priesthood from the time of the Hebrews going into Egypt, to the Exodus, as appears by their comments, a period of 215 years, when the Levitical priesthood was established. But as God never was without a church on earth, so we find that the church was maintained in all its plenitude in Egypt, agreeably to the divine institution, by the residence of the *SHRINAH*, or divine dwelling, the *CHERUBIM*, and the *HOLY OF HOLIES* ; otherwise it would have been needless for Joseph and his posterity to have succeeded to the *birthright*, which embraced the priesthood then confirmed on Joseph. See 1 Chron. v. 1.

Which I took. וָקִיחַ *lakachti*, is translated *I took* ; but this verb has different modes of expression, agreeably to the idiom, as in all languages : it means, *to take, to take away, to receive, to carry away,*

even what he will declare among you, in the last days.

2 Congregate, and hearken ye, sons of Jacob : also obey before Israel your father.

3 Reuben, my firstborn thou ; my power, but the beginning of my sorrow : excellency accepted, even the excellency of strength.

4 Unstable as water, thou shalt not have the

1 Sam. xxx. 18 ; *to fetch*, 2 Sam. iv. 6. The last proposition in this verse, *with my sword and with my bow*, will then have a proper application, for Jacob did not take any thing from the Amorite *with his sword and bow*, which he gave to Joseph.

The Amorites were gross idolaters ; and after the affair at Shechem concerning the daughter of Jacob, there can be no doubt but that the idolaters, their neighbours, would revenge the injury done to the people of Shechem. Jacob expected this return, ch. xxxiv. 30 ; and he fled, having been directed to go to Beth-el. Had Jacob not fled, the whole family of the patriarch would have been massacred, and the *priesthood*, *THE PORTION* which he now gave to Joseph, would, in such case, have been extinct, but which *he preserved with his sword and with his bow* ; or, in other words, they were obliged to defend themselves against the idolaters until they were safe in Beth-el.

And bring you again. There is no authority for the word *again*, which must appear incorrect, as the word *again* implies that God had brought them to the land of their fathers before that period.

The word עִמָּךְ *ethem*, is rendered by *you*, which is also incorrect ; it is a compound of עִמָּךְ *eth*, *with* ; and כִּי *hem*, *you*. The clause reads, *And return with you.*

NOTES ON CHAP. XLIX.

1. This is a continuation of the discourse in the last chapter, which has been separated by those who improperly divided the scripture into chapters ; for ch. xlviii. and ch. xlix. ought to have made but one chapter : in which the entire subject of the divine communication, given to Jacob in the usual way, from above the Cherubim, respecting the patriarchs as representative of the Messiah, begins and finishes.

It will be recollected, that the priesthood had passed over to Joseph ; and in the 15th verse of the 48th chapter, Jacob delivered the blessing first to him, where it is said, *And he blessed Joseph and said, God, before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac went forth.* In the common version חִיְהַיְהוּ *hithalkou*, is rendered *did walk* ; but this does not appear to be the precise meaning of the sacred writer, though this meaning be comprehended by the word : for, in this sense, other good men walked before God, as well as Abraham and Isaac. This word was applied by the patriarch with reference to their going forth before the Cherubim while the sacrifice was upon the altar, when they entered the Holy of Holies with the incense, and received the divine communication. I have therefore translated it as it is so translated in various parts of scripture ; by *went forth* ; *went*, Gen. xiv. 24 ; Exod. xv. 29 ; Josh. ii. 6 ; *went along*, 1 Sam. vi. 12 ; *went to* ; —xiv. 16, &c.

I find this word so used in Zech. i. 10, 12, when the angels (Heb. messengers) of the Lord *went forth* before the Cherubim with the incense ; where, in the common version, it is said, *And they answered the angel of the Lord that stood among the myrtle trees.* But this translation is incorrect. There is no word in the original for *trees*, for the word עֲצֵי *bahadim*.

excellency; though thou hast ascended before the mansion of thy father: now thou *art* defiled, my floor he ascended.

which is translated by *myrtle trees*, has no such meaning. The Hebrew word appears to have been retained in the ancient versions. The Greek *Hēus hedus*, means *sweet*, and thus, because of the fragrance and sweetness of the myrtle, it had its Greek and Latin name, *Murus*, and *myrtus*, from *μυρον* perfume, sweet ointment. Parkhurst.

The sons of Jacob were commanded to assemble; when Joseph, being acquainted, came with his two sons, and it was before all of them that Jacob confirmed the priesthood on Joseph and on his posterity. The reason for this is obvious, as Reuben had attempted to take the priesthood in conjunction with Dan and Gad (see on ch. xxxv. 22) it was done in this public manner, to prevent any contention for it after his death.

Gather yourselves together. This is a very improper mode of expression; there is no authority for the words *yourselves together*; *לעצמם* *le'atzmam*, is literally *assemble ye*.

That I may tell you. There is no subjunctive mood in the language: *אניידה לך אמידה* *anidah la'kem*, truly read, *for I will declare to you*. See Gen. xli. 32; Jer. xxxiii. 3.

That which shall befall you. The word *יגיד* *yigra*, is rendered *befall*; but it certainly cannot have this reading. It is the third person singular future of the verb *to call, proclaim, publish, preach, pronounce, recite, declare*, agreeably to the idiom; and it literally reads *he will declare*. But the question is, who is the person here referred to by the word *יגיד* *yigra*, who was to proclaim the things mentioned in the last days?

In the last verse but one preceding it is said, *God will be with you*. The last verse of the preceding chapter, and the first verse of this 49th chapter, as far as the beginning of the second proposition (*I will declare*), are read in a parenthesis, which is signified by its proper accent. This verb then refers to the last verse but one, the 21st of the preceding chapter, where it is said, *God will be with you, and return with you again unto the land of your fathers*; it then follows at the end of the parenthesis, *moreover I will tell to you, that which he (God) will declare among you in the last days*.

These words, *the last days*, were evidently applied to three states of the priesthood, viz. the priesthood of the *ancient church* under the dispensation given to Noah, to which Joseph succeeded, at the *LAST DAYS*, or end of which they were to be delivered from Egypt; 2dly, The *LAST DAYS* of the priesthood under the dispensation given to Moses, when the Levitical priesthood was to cease; and, 3dly, The *LAST DAYS*, or the final priesthood of *MESSIAH*, to whose eternal reign this verb *יגיד* *yigra*, is applicable: viz. he will *proclaim, publish*, and dispense the great mercies which the patriarch was shewn God had laid up for his people.

All this appears sufficiently evident; first from the above-mentioned 21st verse of the preceding chapter, which is the verse but one before this, when they were to be delivered from their bondage, and restored to their own land, at the establishment of the Levitical priesthood, which was at the *LAST DAYS*, or the end of the Noachitic priesthood, in the line of Joseph. The second division of the *LAST DAYS* is pointed out in the 7th verse of this chapter, where Jacob foretells the end of the Levitical priesthood. And the third division of the *LAST DAYS* is shewn in that most important verse, the 10th verse of this chapter, where the true priesthood of Judah centering in *SHILOH* the *DELIVERER*, who was not of the order of the Levitical priesthood, is clearly described.

5 ¶ Simeon and Levi, brethren: instruments of violence are in their habitations.

6 Into their council, thou shalt not come O

2. *Gather yourselves together.* In the common version the first verse, and this, begin with the same words, though the verbs are different. There surely was no necessity for them to be told twice to gather themselves together, unless the words rendered *gather yourselves together*, were applied to something more than had been signified in the first verse, viz. simply collecting around the bed of the patriarch. The word *קבצו* *kaabetsu*, means to meet in great multitudes; 1 Sam. vii. 6; 1 Chron. xi. 7. The first address therefore of Jacob to them was, that after his decease they were to maintain the worship of God: he says, *congregate ye*.

But we here find another repetition, and more improper. In this short verse Jacob is made to call twice upon his sons to hear him, viz. *hear, ye sons of Jacob, and hearken unto Israel your father*. If in the first instance they were to hear him, as it is evident they did, then there was no necessity for him to say, *hearken unto Israel your father*. Some writers have praised the beauties of this chapter by giving it the character of a fine poetic composition. I cannot find any thing like poetry in it; the patriarchs and prophets were never commissioned to deliver their communications in poetry. The language is certainly dignified in the original, but by such repetitions as we find in these two verses in the common version, the beauty of the original is not seen.

The word *שמעו* *ve shimgnu*, rendered *hearken*, in the second proposition, being a repetition of the verb, and of the same person of the verb in the first proposition, should have been translated with the same meaning as the verb is translated, Numb. xxvii. 20, *that all the children of Israel may be obedient*; 1 Chron. xxix. 23, *And then they OBEYED*; Jer. vii. 23, *Obeys*; which then reads, *ye shall be obedient*.

3. *The beginning of my strength.* It certainly is not possible to understand this clause as it stands in the common version, how Reuben could be the *beginning of the strength* of Jacob. The sacred writer surely would not have mentioned a thing so unimportant, and unnecessary. The word *אני* *ani*, here rendered *my strength*, comes from *אנא* *ana*, which has two branches for application. It means primarily *iniquity*, Numb. xxiii. 21; *vanity*, Job xv. 35; *affliction*, the result of iniquity and vanity; — v. 6. Secondly, it means to complain, to *mourn*, Deut. xxvi. 14; Hos. ix. 4; *trouble, or sorrow*, Gen. xxxv. 28, she called his name *בן-אני* *Ben ani*, the son of my sorrow.

Now it appears from the following verse that Reuben is charged by Jacob as having done something which occasioned him much trouble; and by referring to ch. xxxv. we shall find what it was that gave Jacob this trouble. I therefore translate the word *אני* *ani*, as it is translated in the above passages, which is its true radical meaning, and which is then in conformity with the obvious meaning of the sacred writer.

4. *Thou shalt not excel.* This passage has been misapprehended by commentators, who have supposed that the words referred to the tribe of Reuben as a people; and so we are told in the language of a modern writer, that "this tribe never rose to any eminence in Israel—was not so numerous by one third as either Judah or Dan." But this application has nothing to do with the meaning of the passage; for if the tribe of Reuben was not so numerous as Judah and Dan, it was more numerous than the tribes of Asher and Gad.

The word *excel* is indefinite; we know not to what it is

my soul; to their congregation, be thou not united mine honour: for in their anger they

slew men; and for their pleasure, they extirpated the bull.

applied, and therefore the above erroneous application has been made. *naw seeth*, is here rendered by *dignity*. This word has eight distinct applications, all partaking of the import of the root *naw*; *nausaa*, to accept, in whatever sense it may be applied, as to princes, chiefs, or the accepted ones, in honour, excellency, dignity, power; to restore to favour, &c. See Prov. xviii. 5. *It is not good to naw seeth*, ACCEPT the persons of the wicked. The clause is then clear and express. It plainly means that once Reuben was to have succeeded to the priesthood, as the eldest firstborn son; and as such, that he had been accepted; it then passed over to the next firstborn, Joseph.

Because thou wentest up to my bed. This passage has a reference to ch. xxxv. ver. 22; where the translators, not attending to the different modes of expression, necessarily implied by this word, according to idiom, have made it appear that Reuben lay with Bilhah; and that this was the crime for which he was deprived of the succession to the priesthood. The translation is neither consistent with the original, nor with the possibility of nature; and, consequently, it cannot be the meaning of the sacred writer; see on ch. xxxv. 22; where it appears that Bilhah was too far advanced in years, when this thing is said to have taken place.

The word *shechibah* is rendered *bed*; it is a general word applied to mean a peculiar state in life; see Psa. lvi. 4, *I lie among those who are set on fire*; viz. his mansion, or dwelling was among them;—lxviii. 13, *Though ye have lien among the pots, Heb. though ye abide among the sheepfolds*. It also means a place of safety, or rest, where a person is quiet, Job xxx. 17; Eccles. ii. 23; 2 Sam. vii. 12. As a noun it is applied to the mansions, or resting places, of those who are departed; Isa. lvii. 2, *They shall rest in their beds*; but it is evident that the word *mishkibotham*, should be here translated by *in their mansions*; viz. the mansions in the eternal world. God is not the God of the dead, but of the living. In allusion to this passage it was that the Redeemer said, *In my Father's house there are many mansions*. In the passage before us it means the house or mansion of rest, viz. the sacred dwelling where God communed with his people from above the Cherubim. Here it was where Reuben attempted to ascend, and not only to ascend as the high priest, but as the supreme ruler over church and state, and to restore the ancient order of supreme government.

He went up to my couch. In the common version the patriarch had in this verse once said, that Reuben *went up to his bed*; so that there was no necessity to repeat the same thing immediately, by saying, as the translators have purposed him to say, *he went up to my couch*. The diction of the Hebrew scripture is too correct and concise to admit of such a repetition. *wy Gnerush*, means a couch, Amos iii. 12;—vi. 4; but *yetsougni*, properly means a floor; in 1 Kings, vi. 5, 6, 10, it is rendered *chambers*, but it plainly means a floor, where the offerings brought in by the people were spread, and where the sacrifices were laid before the altar; and therefore it is said, he made floors *round about*, Heb. *around*; viz. around the altar, to contain these offerings when they were brought to the temple, which at various seasons of the year, when the first fruits were brought, must have been in great quantities. Hence in a secondary sense it has been applied to mean a bed, because it is the floor on which a person is stretched. In the passage before us it means the floor of the elevated platform before the altar; from which we learn, that Reuben ascended the *yis yetsougni*,

the floor, or the elevated platform of his father, where he offered the sacrifices, and thus forcibly to seize the office of the priesthood.

The primary cause of the defection of Reuben does not appear in the common version; it is plain, however, that he attempted to overturn the then existing order of things in the church, and to restore the ancient order, such as was in the time of Noah. Under the first patriarchal government the ruling patriarch exercised a dominion both in church and state; for we find that the descent is regular: it is said, such a one lived so many years; by which, agreeably to that order of government, that he also governed, or was the supreme governor of both departments. And so they regularly descended from father to son in the hereditary line, governing in things spiritual and temporal, to the time of Noah. Hence we find that under the operation of the divine dispensation from the beginning, the firstborn son succeeded to the supreme government, even to the time of Peleg. Here we see that the firstborn son in like manner succeeded to the priesthood, but a division taking place in his reign, it appears that the offices of priest and king were separated, and took their beginning in this distinct order at that period. Notwithstanding a few remains of this first divine establishment are recorded as late as the first years of the ministry of Abraham. Melchizedek was king of Salem, and a priest of the most high God; ch. xiv. 18; also, Jethro was a prince, and a priest of Midian. Now from the whole tenor of the narrative, the crime of Reuben appears to have been an attempt to subvert the existing order, to restore the ancient one, and, as the firstborn, to take the sole government into his own hand; in which attempt he was powerfully supported by his brethren.

There is another circumstance overlooked by commentators, which throws much light on the subject, viz. this attempt of Reuben to overturn the priesthood of Joseph was in conjunction with the sons of Bilhah and Zilpah, who were also of the order of the firstborn. And as the firstborn sons could only succeed to the priesthood, the evil report which Joseph brought to his father when he had been conversing with them, ch. xxxvii. 2, was on the attempt of Reuben, in conjunction with Dan and Gad, to seize the priesthood. Moreover, as the priesthood would have been his, had he continued to officiate in the appointed way; it necessarily follows that he meant to introduce a different form of worship. That this was the crime, and not the crime imputed to him in the common version, does not only appear when we examine the Hebrew, which is the surest proof, but also from this minor consideration. Had he been guilty of the crime with which he is charged in the common version, the son of Bilhah would not have joined him in the attempt to establish the ancient order of the priesthood and government. I refer the reader to what is said on ch. xxxvii. 3, where he will find this view confirmed; when Jacob, after Joseph brought their evil report, made him the garment of supplication: which develops the cause of the defection of Reuben, as above, and the ground of the hatred of the brethren of Joseph to him.

But a question of this nature may be asked: Where was the necessity for a priesthood among such a small assembly of people, viz. a father and his twelve sons? And if this had been the case, Where was the wisdom of contending for the exercise of the priesthood in one family? The reader will recollect that the church had been established from the time of Abra-

7 Cursed be their anger for it prevailed, yea their rage was cruel: I will divide them from Jacob, and scatter them with Israel.

ham: the progress he had made in converting the people of the land of Canaan to the worship of God, was astonishing. Even the surrounding nations had learnt that Jehovah was the God of heaven and earth, as we have seen when Abraham went to Gerar, where Abimelech the king was a worshipper of God. Also when he went to Egypt, there were many of the people who were worshippers of God, or rather the true worship of God was at that period common in Egypt; therefore it does not appear that Joseph was a priest to his own solitary family only; for they had the free exercise of their religion even to the time of Exodus. But when Joseph was there, he was thus considered as the high priest of the whole church of God, not only in Egypt, but throughout the whole land of Canaan, where it had been established by Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

Hence it appears that the real cause of the defection of Reuben was his attempt to overturn the divinely established order of the church, and to secure supreme dominion, which rendered him altogether ineligible to have succeeded to the priesthood, had there been no other legal successor, as observed. This is also sanctioned by his conduct to Joseph, for though he wished to spare his life, he submitted to his being transported to Egypt, until, in the order of Divine Providence, imperious necessity led the way to the development of the crime.

6. *O my soul, come not thou into their secret.* This passage, as it stands in the common version, affords us no information; it is altogether inexplicable: it cannot possibly be applied to the secret of the slaughter of the Shechemites by Simeon and Levi. Some commentators have said that this clause should be translated thus: *Into their council, O my soul, thou didst not come:* but as the verb *taabo*, is not the second person preter of the verb, but the second person future, it cannot be so translated; and therefore does not refer to any secret concerning the slaying of the Shechemites.

סוד *Herodam*, rendered *secret*, properly means *council*; Jer. vi. 11;—xxiii. 18; viz. *Into their council thou shalt not come; O my soul.*

איש *Aish*, rendered *man*, is a general term; it means *man-kind*, Job xii. 10; *the man*, 1 Sam. xiii. 6; Jud. xx. 17.

And in their self-will they digged down a wall. But the word *shor*, never means a wall; its meaning is a bull, throughout the scripture.

Hence it is that the translators, not knowing how to apply the word *shor*, a bull, have concluded that this passage was applied by the sacred writer to the violence done by the sons of Jacob, and the manifest displeasure shewn by him concerning the act they had committed. But this cannot be admitted, for the patriarch had shown his displeasure near fifty years before this period, when this total departure from the commands of God under that dispensation, gave birth to the slaughter of the Shechemites. I say a departure from the commands of God, from the positive precepts of that dispensation it was, which caused him to say, *thou shalt not come into their council.* Beside it cannot be admitted that Jacob, for near fifty years from the time of that transaction, never came into the assembly of his sons. But there evidently was no such meaning in the mind of the patriarch; he could not come into the secret assembly, or council, of that which had been transacted at so remote, or at any past period; there was no necessity for his council or approbation.

8 ¶ Thou Judah, thy brethren shall praise thee; thy hand shall be on the neck of thine enemies: the sons of thy father, shall bow before thee.

Neither would it be of any consequence to posterity to know that they slew a bull. Thus, though we have the true translation of the word *shor*, by *bull*; still we are at a loss to know its true application, unless we confine our views to the whole tenor of the narrative, which makes the distinction between the worship of God, agreeably to his commands under that dispensation, and the worship of idols.

The bull was the primary representative sacrifice in all the churches before this period, but in process of time we find, when the sacrifice was only looked at, without attending to its meaning or application; that the establishment of idolatry became general, Psa. cvi. 10, 20; the creature was worshipped instead of the Creator, and its application to Messiah altogether neglected. The bull thus being the primary idol in the land of Canaan, it is obvious that the sons of Israel slew the people in a revengeful spirit, contrary to the express command of God to Noah, ch. ix. 6.

אשר יצו ביהם, is rendered *self-will*, but *anger* and *self-will*, as here applied, are the same; if they slew a man in their anger or self-will, they dug down a wall in their anger or self-will. This word means *pleasure, desire, delight, to be gratified*, Neh. ix. 37; 2 Chron. xv. 15; Prov. xi. 30; it reads *and for their pleasure.*

They digged down a wall. This clause cannot be understood; for if in their self-will they dug down a wall, it certainly was of too little consequence for the sacred writer to have committed it to posterity. It is proper here to inform those who do not understand the Hebrew, that the word *shor*, a bull, which the translators have rendered by *wall*, has the very same consonants as *shur*, a wall; and as the vowels, which vary the meaning and application (as in all languages) are not written between the consonants, as is the custom in the western or European languages, but under the consonants; the translators who have not attended to this most important branch of Hebrew learning, have rendered this word, which throughout the scriptures means a bull, by *shur*, which always means a wall. See 2 Sam. vi. 13; Neh. v. 15; Job vi. 9; Exod. xxi. 18; 2 Sam. xxii. 30; Job xxi. 11; Jer. xxv. 10.

Some commentators also, not knowing what to make of the passage as it stands in the common version, have taken an unpardonable liberty with the sacred letter, by translating *shor*, a bull, by *shur*, a prince; but to render *shor*, a bull, by *saar*, a prince, after the manner of Kennicott and others who have followed him, is altogether inconsistent with the language; it has no such meaning in any part of scripture. The error committed in the English, and in all the European translations, is equally condemnable; for there cannot be a greater contrariety than between a wall and a bull. We shall however find the original to be perfectly consistent with good sense, consequently with the meaning of the sacred writer, without rendering *shor*, a bull, by *shur*, a wall, or by *saar*, a prince.

גפרו *gnikrou*, is translated, *they digged down*; but this word does not properly mean to dig; neither is there any word for down; it is one word, and cannot have this sense in any part of scripture. It truly means to cut in pieces, hough, hamstring, Josh. ix. 9; 2 Sam. viii. 4; 1 Chron. xviii. 4.

To shew the folly of their idol worship, and how incapable these idols were of saving them, though they put their trust in

9 Judah, a young lion; my son thou hast ascended with the prey: he stooped, he couched

as a lion, and as an old lion, who shall rouse him?

them, they *hamstrung* or *houghed* their consecrated bull; which, with the consideration of Jacob's being the patriarch of the church, operated as a stimulus to convince them of the weakness of their cause, and on which account it could only be said, ch. xxxv. 5, and the terror of God was upon the cities that were round about them.

By the connection of this verse with the following, it will be seen, that the patriarch referred to the two orders of the priesthood, viz. the priesthood of Jacob, and the priesthood of Levi. The priesthood of Jacob established by Noah, prohibited the shedding of man's blood, unless the man had himself committed the crime; but the Levitical law was more severe, it punished several crimes with death, and was given because the state of the people required it. Therefore the crime they had committed was in direct violation of the command under that dispensation. So that Jacob having thus promulgated the divine command concerning this great precept given to Noah, says, *Thou shalt not come into their council, O my soul, viz. the establishment, or council of the Levitical priesthood, at the end of the priesthood of Joseph.* Thus they were to remain separate, and to promulgate the statutes, laws, ordinances, rites, and ceremonies, as given to Noah, taught by Abraham, established by Isaac, and delivered to Jacob; even to the last period of that order, at which period they were to be delivered from Egypt. When the Mosaic dispensation superseded the Noahic, the priesthood of the firstborn, and the order of the Melchizedekian priesthood ceased; when the Levites were admitted to the priesthood exclusively, instead of the firstborn.

7. *I will divide them in Jacob.* This is altogether unintelligible in the common version. We do not know what can possibly be meant by *dividing* the tribe of Levi in Jacob, and *scattering* them in Israel. No such division in Jacob ever took place, for when they were delivered from the bondage in Egypt, which was near two hundred years after this period, they had not been divided, but made one of the twelve tribes. It may with equal propriety be said, that the other tribes were to be divided in Jacob, as that the tribe of Levi was to be divided in Jacob.

By Jacob, is here meant the priesthood which was in the line of Jacob by Joseph, from which the Levitical priesthood was to be divided at the *last days*—an expression signifying the last days of the thing spoken of, or at the end of the priesthood of Jacob; when the priesthood was to be established in the tribe of Levi, called the Levitical priesthood. Now as there is no such circumstance as the tribe of Levi being divided in Jacob, and as this priesthood was divided from that of Jacob, we are certain that the *2 beth*, prefixed to *אֶפְרַיִם Jacob*, is truly to be translated by *from*, as in other places of scripture, instead of *in*, which is then good sense, and consistent with the history, viz. *I will divide them from Jacob.*

And *scatter them in Israel.* In the common version, the clause, *I will divide them in Jacob, and scatter them in Israel*, is understood to mean the same thing, viz. that they should be *divided or scattered* among the people; and the words *Jacob and Israel*, are also supposed to have one meaning, viz. that *Jacob means Israel, and Israel, Jacob*; that is, the whole people his descendants when they became a nation.

But, in such case, it must appear that there is much unnecessary repetition, a thing not known in the Hebrew scripture; *divide and scatter*, with such application, would have the same meaning; and one of the two words, *Jacob and Israel*,

might have been dispensed with. Both these suppositions, however, are far from the truth; there are no such expletive expressions in the original scriptures; such errors have arisen from the ignorance of the translators, who evidently had neither a competent knowledge of the Hebrew, nor understood what the patriarch meant by the original passage, which they have translated, *I will divide them in Jacob, and scatter them in Israel.* This is a serious charge to bring against them; but the translation of the first part, together with the application of the words *divide and scatter*, and *Jacob and Israel*, will shew, first, that the priesthood of Levi was to be divided *from* the priesthood in the line of Jacob; (this was when they returned to the land of Canaan) and, secondly, that they were to be literally scattered throughout the whole nation of Israel: so we find that the tribe of Levi filled the office of the priesthood, and had no part of the division of the land, except forty-eight cities given them in different parts of the nation, from whence they sent their brethren to officiate in all the synagogues throughout the land of Israel. As to the tribe of Simeon, his portion was too small, and they separated, forming different colonies, Chron. iv. 39. Thus they were *divided and scattered*, agreeably to the communication given to Jacob. For they were by law for ever cut off from having any authority in the regal government, either patriarchal or kingly.

The sense of the passage, the construction of this last clause, and the stop *hataf*, at the word *Jacob*, shew that the *2 beth* prefixed to *אֶפְרַיִם aphitsem*, i. e. *scattered*, cannot be translated by a conjunction copulative here; it is adverbial, and should be rendered by *thus*, or, *in this manner, in this wise*, viz. *thus I will scatter them בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל with Israel.* The pronoun of the first person is then properly retained, without an awkward repetition, which could not be in the common version; as it would have been very bad reading to have said, *I will divide them, and I will scatter them.* The *2 beth* prefixed to *Israel*, supplies the ablative case, as in Josh. x. 11; 1 Sam. iv. 8; Job x. 11, &c. This evidently means, that they were to remain in this state, not only until the kingdom of Israel continued a kingdom, but that they should be finally *scattered with the Israelites*; that notwithstanding they being priests, and might, on that account, (having nothing to do with war,) have been spared by the conqueror when the nation of Israel was taken into captivity; yet we find they were to be *scattered with Israel*, viz. with those who constituted the kingdom, the regal government of Israel, of which they were never to form a part; and which was accordingly accomplished.

But a question of great importance arises here. If the whole tribes of Simeon and Levi were thus to be cut off from the privileges enjoyed by the rest, when they became a nation, a thousand years after this transaction, how can this agree with the unimpeachable justice of the divine legislation? or with the positive declaration of scripture, which says, Deut. xxiv. 16, *The fathers shall not be put to death for the children, neither shall the children be put to death for the fathers; every man shall be put to death for his own sin?*

The reader will remember, that this declaration of the patriarch was applied, as is stated in the first verse, to the *latter days*, viz. in the latter days of the Theocracy, or the divine government, which was representative of the coming of the Messiah, and not to the then existing state of things among his children. His soul was carried to the future development of those transactions and things which were to give these tribes

10 The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, till Shiloh

come; then the people shall congregate before him.

their real character, a *state* of things which was to be manifested under the Levitical priesthood, corresponding to the states of the people in conformity with what had been manifested in this transaction. A *state* very different from the pure, simple, patriarchal order of things, the governor being the common father, as was the state of this divine government, from Adam to the priesthood of Jacob; when the firstborn son, without distinction, was eligible to officiate in the sacred office. To this period, as observed, to this latter day, or last state of the theocracy, he was directed to look; he had received these divine communications in the usual way from above the Cherubim, in the Holy of Holies. There the veil of futurity was removed, and he was thus enabled to speak to his posterity concerning the real state of the people under the monarchy of Israel. A *state*, not like the peaceable, lamb-like state, when the patriarchal government prevailed—when their ploughshares were used instead of swords—when insatiable ambition had not destroyed the happiness of man—when their pruning-hooks were used instead of spears, and vineyards were the places of rendezvous, instead of the field of battle; but a *state* which required the spirit of Simeon and Levi, and the power of the sword, to keep the vicious within the bounds of social order, for the preservation even of the last, and lowest state of the theocratical government.

8. *Judah*. The fourth son of Leah. This word means *praise*, ch. xxx. 35. *And she said, Now I will praise the Lord, therefore she called his name Judah*. The patriarch opens the prophecy concerning Judah, agreeably to the import of his name, *Judah, thou art he whom thy brethren shall praise; thy father's children shall bow down before thee*. This, as it respects the tribe, refers to that period when the tribe of Judah had obtained great dignity and power; for it appears from the history, that the children of his father did not bow down before him.

If we turn to the history, we shall find that the prediction was accomplished. In the 9th verse the patriarch describes the dominion of this tribe, by the most noble of all animals, the lion, in all its stages, from *אריה* *arjeh*, a young lion going forth for its prey; the conquests and the dominion, by a *coaching lion*, ready to spring; and the duration of the government, by *לביא* *lubia*, a lion in his strength. But as all the prophecies in this most important chapter, were given to signify their accomplishment in the person of Messiah, the *BRUISER* of the serpent, the *SHILOH* of Jacob, and the *LION* of the tribe of Judah, concerning whom we read, *to him shall the gathering of the people be*; therefore the patriarch, in the divine communication referring to the last days of the Theocracy, and the commencement of the last dispensation, was directed to say; *Judah, thou art he whom thy brethren shall praise; thy hand shall be in the neck of thine enemies; thy father's children shall bow down before thee*.

The word *יודון* *yodouna*, which is rendered *shall praise thee*, signifies the highest degree of praise, as is evident from the origin of the word at the birth of Judah, ch. xxix. 35. *And she said, Now I will praise the Lord: therefore she called his name Judah*; see also 11 Sam. xii. 50. *I will give thanks unto thee, O Lord, Psa. xviii. 49; I will praise thee*;—xxxv. 18;—li. 9;—lvi. 9;—lxxi. 22;—lxxxvi. 12, &c.

But this was never accomplished among the sons of Jacob; they never bowed; they never gave this praise to Judah. It was never verified during the reigns of the judges of Israel;

neither was it accomplished during the monarchy; no person ever arose to whom this praise was ever given. David was not even allowed to build a temple for God. And with regard to Solomon, though he was allowed to build the temple, it was only because he had not been a man of war; for afterwards we find he countenanced the idolatry of the daughter of Pharaoh. The world in his time had universal peace, and, agreeably to the meaning of his name, that period was referred to when the peaceful reign which was to follow, was consequent on keeping the precepts which were to be given at the coming of the Messiah.

Thy father's children shall bow down before thee. This last clause opens to our view a circumstance which has not been apprehended by translators. The patriarch here alluded to his children when they bowed before Joseph, which he was now directed to apply to Judah. If the circumstance of the dignity of Joseph at this period be considered, that he was the greatest man in Egypt except Pharaoh; that he had been the person appointed, not only to save his own family, but all the surrounding nations, from death; it is natural to conclude, that this great degree of pre-eminence which was here foretold concerning Judah, should have been given to Joseph. This not being the case, it becomes necessary to assign a reason why it was spoken of Judah.

As the things spoken of in this verse were not accomplished during the Theocracy, it must be evident that it was applied to a state of things which was represented by the then existing order of the priesthood. Joseph had succeeded to the priesthood: he was a priest after the order of Melchizedek, chosen out of the firstborn; which priesthood represented the priesthood of the Messiah, the lion of the tribe of Judah, who was to be chosen after the manner of the firstborn, and not from the Levitical priesthood; who was to be a priest like Joseph, after the order of Melchizedek, and who was to make his appearance at the end of the Theocracy. Therefore he was directed to apply the words, *Thy father's children shall bow down before thee*, to the Messiah; before whom the people were to congregate, and whose priesthood was to be eternal.

AN OLD LION, who shall rouse him up? This evidently refers to the duration of this government, at the end of the Theocracy; the government of the Messiah, when the last dispensation was to be given, which was to continue till the end of all things.

The camps of the Hebrews when they went forth from Egypt, were four; three tribes in every camp. The camp of Judah, as well as the tribe of Judah, was the most numerous; it always took its position on the east of the other camps, marching the first, and thus maintaining its courageous character.

10. *The sceptre shall not depart from Judah*. Christians and Jews both lay their claim to this passage. The Christians, as proving that *SHILOH* means the Redeemer, and that this prophecy was accomplished when he came; the Jews, to prove that the true Messiah is not yet come.

Two objections have been advanced against the sense in which Christians have understood this remarkable passage. The first is, "that if the word *SHILOH* meant the Christian Redeemer, the other part of the declaration should agree with it, viz. the *sceptre* and the *lawgiver* should not have departed until *Shiloh* made his appearance. But we are told that the *sceptre* and the *lawgiver* departed from Judah at the Baby-

11 Binding his colt to the vine, even the offspring of his ass to the yellow vine: he

lonish captivity, upwards of six hundred years before the Christian Redeemer appeared; and at the return, the nation was not governed during that period by the tribe of Judah, but by strangers, the Amoneans and Herodians; therefore Shiloh cannot mean Christ."

The second objection is, "that there are two words which the Christian translators have not truly translated, viz. *נִשְׁבֵּט* *gnad hi*; *gnad* means FOR EVER, and *hi*, BECAUSE: and the Jews say the true reading is, *The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet* (*gnad*) FOR EVER, (*hi*) BECAUSE *Shiloh will come*." Thus the Jews admit that the sceptre was to depart; but though the sceptre and lawgiver are departed for 1800 years, they are not departed for ever, because Shiloh, their Messiah, will come and restore them again. The departure of the sceptre, however, was never admitted by the ancient Jews.

Before I proceed with the text itself, it may be proper to inform the reader how it was understood and applied by the ancient Rabbies before the commencement of the Christian era; and with regard to Jewish authority, we learn, that the Targums of Onkelos on the Law, and Jonathan on the Prophets, have been esteemed as ancient as the time of Christ. It is allowed that Onkelos lived some few years before, and Jonathan about that period. The word Targum means an interpretation; I shall therefore show how these great doctors understood and applied the passage.

The word *נִשְׁבֵּט* *shebet*, which in the translation is rendered *sceptre*, an emblem of power, means also a rod, the emblem of punishment; so that we are told, by some modern writers among the Jews, it could only mean their present long captivity, which punishment was not to depart till their Shiloh shall come to deliver them, and to restore them to their own land. The Targums inform us that at this period they understood the passage to refer to the Messiah. But if the scriptures were thus understood at that period, there can be no doubt but that the ancient Hebrews from before the time of Moses, and to the dispersion, understood it to refer to the Messiah. The words of Onkelos are:—"There shall not be taken away from Judah one having the principality, nor the scribe from the sons of his children, till the Messiah shall come." So we find that the Jerusalem Targum, and that written by Jonathan, agree with him in the translation of this text; for they inform us that *נִשְׁבֵּט* *Shiloh*, means the Messiah, and *נִשְׁבֵּט* *shebet*, the principality. Thus did the great body of the Jewish doctors before Christ, in plain terms, teach the nation, that the sovereignty, or the government, should not depart from Judah till the time of the Messiah.

With regard to the first objection, that the sceptre and lawgiver departed 600 years before Christ; we shall find that this prophecy contains important matter, which has been overlooked both by Christians and Jews. In this passage, agreeably to the literal sense, the patriarch spake of the regal power or monarchy of Judah; for during their captivity in Egypt, no superiority appeared in the tribe of Judah. At the Exodus, nothing of this nature could be applied to Moses, he being of the tribe of Levi; nor is it at all applicable to the Hebrew government during the reign of the Judges from Moses to David; as they were governed by Judges from different tribes during that interval. Neither can the words possibly be exclusively applied to the Hebrew monarchy from David to the time of the captivity in Babylon, nor to any person of the

cleansed his vesture by wine, also his clothes by the blood of grapes.

tribe of Judah during the reign of the kings of Judah. For at the conclusion of the Davidian dynasty, or of that sceptre departing from Judah, no Shiloh made his appearance. And though the sceptre or government was suspended for a time in their own land, it was acknowledged among themselves during the captivity, and appeared again in the line of Judah at their return to Jerusalem.

Hence it appears that the government or sceptre did not finally depart from Judah at the captivity; so that it was evidently to that period of the Hebrew government commencing at the return from the captivity to its final departure, at the destruction of Jerusalem, and the dispersion of the people, to which the patriarch was directed to apply these words.

It is also true, that the government or sceptre did not long continue in the tribe of Judah after the return from the captivity; and this will lead us to the true and obvious meaning of the patriarch when he applied these words to Judah.

From the time of the establishment of the kingdom of Judah by the two tribes of Judah and Benjamin, under Rehoboam the son of Solomon; they were spoken of as one body, and the kingdom took the title of the kingdom of Judah. Zech. xii. 2, *Behold, I will make Jerusalem a cup of trembling unto all the people round about, when they shall be in the siege both against Judah and against Jerusalem*; Mal. ii. 11, *Judah hath transgressed*; ch. iii. 4, *Then shall the offerings of Judah and Jerusalem be acceptable unto the Lord, as in old time and the years before*. These words were spoken after the return from the captivity, and evidently mean by Judah in old time, the nation of Judah from Rehoboam, in whose time the two tribes were called by the title of the kingdom of Judah. From which it appears that the prophets, after the return from the captivity, always called the nation by the name or title of Judah.

Hence it is evident that the patriarch applied the passage, *the sceptre shall not depart from Judah*, to the last division of the government, commencing at the return from Babylon, and ending with the dispersion of that people, the whole nation being called JUDAH; and not to any lineal descendant of his son Judah, in preference to the descendants of his son Benjamin. But foreseeing that the government of Israel would not be of long duration, (for the plain declaration that the sceptre should not depart from Judah, and his silence with regard to the kingdom of Israel, evidently inform us, that the sceptre should not remain with Israel,) but that it should remain with Judah, or the Jewish nation. He emphatically says, *the sceptre shall not depart from Judah*: that the lawgiver should not depart, that the nation of Judah should exist, and that they should be governed by their ancient laws, until Shiloh should come. This appears to have been the case, for the judicial power was always exercised by the nation of Judah; see John xviii. 31. *Take ye him and judge him according to your law*;—xix. 7; *The Jews answered him, We have a law, and by our law he ought to die*.

With regard to Shiloh yet to come, agreeably to the opinion of the Jews, Christians say, that there is not even the shadow of an authority in any part of scripture to support it; that the prophets who lived at the return from the captivity in Babylon, have declared on the ground of all the preceding prophecies, that this person, who is called the messenger (Shiloh) of the covenant, Mal. iii. 1, was to make his appearance in this last state of the government of Judah. He says, *And the Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to his temple*. The prophet

12 His eyes shall sparkle with wine: and his teeth shall be white with milk.

¶ 13 Zebulun, shall dwell at the haven of the sea: he shall be for a haven of ships; with his border to Zidon.

¶ 14 Issachar, a strong ass; resting among the sheepfolds.

Haggai also says, ch. ii. 7, 9; *And the desire of all nations shall come, and I will fill this house with glory, saith the Lord of hosts.—The glory of this latter house shall be greater than of the former, saith the Lord of hosts.* Christians therefore, agreeably to the express declaration of the prophets, believe, that this divine Person, the desire of all nations, was to come during the continuance of this second temple, and that in consequence of his coming to this temple, the glory of this latter house was to be greater than of the former; or what is here meant, the glory of this latter, or last temple worship, should be greater than all the temple worship that had preceded it. But as the second temple was destroyed at the final end of the government of Judah, when the dispersion of that people took place, no such person can now be expected; as it must have been during the continuance of that order, that temple, and that government or sceptre, which was to depart from the nation of Judah at his coming. Christians also say, one thing is certain. As the sceptre and the lawgiver were not to depart until Shiloh made his appearance; and as it is evident to all the world, that the sceptre and the lawgiver have departed now for eighteen hundred years, it is beyond all contradiction evident that Shiloh is come, agreeably to the literal meaning of this prophecy, and to the express declaration of the prophets. Christians therefore profess to be fully convinced, that this prophecy of the coming of Shiloh was literally fulfilled, for the judicial power was exercised by the nation of Judah, and they were governed by their own laws, the laws of Moses, to the end of that government, when the sceptre and the lawgiver, their laws and sacrifices, departed for ever.

THE SECOND OBJECTION comes in a learned shape. It is certainly true that the words *וְיָגֵד לְךָ* *gnad ki*, have the meaning of *ever because*; but we shall find that they cannot have that reading here. The word *וְיָגֵד* *gnad*, has no prefix to authorize the insertion of the word *for*, therefore this cannot be the true translation. The true reading and application of this word are to be confirmed from the scripture only, as applied by the sacred writer. Among those who have followed this reading, I find some Rabbies, lexicographers, and grammarians; but who certainly did not understand what it was to which the word *וְיָגֵד* *gnad*, was applied.

This word has two applications; one to things of time, the other to eternal things. When the sacred writers applied it to God, or eternal things; it certainly means what is eternal; *Psa. cxxxii. 12; Isa. lvii. 15, The high and lofty one that inhabiteth eternity.* But when it is applied to things which have relation to time, it then means time onward, futurity, to the final end of the thing spoken of only; which, as it has respect to that thing, though a thing of time, gives the idea of its end, or termination. *Exod. xii. 18, 23, וְיָגֵד לְךָ* *gnad, UNTIL the one and twentieth day; UNTIL the morning, ch. xvi. 35; UNTIL they came, Deut. i. 7; UNTIL the river, Isa. i. 6.*

Now as in this passage *וְיָגֵד* *gnad*, is applied to time, or to things which have relation to this world only, viz. to the final end of the government of Judah; it cannot be translated for

15 Moreover he looked for a rest that was good; even the land that was delightful: therefore he bowed his shoulder to burden, and became a servant of affliction.

¶ 16 Dan, shall judge his people, as one of the rulers of Israel.

17 Dan will be a serpent in the way, an adder

ever, as it only was applied to the end of the government of Judah, when the sceptre and the lawgiver were to depart from the government of Judah, at the coming of Shiloh, the true Messiah.

That *וְיָגֵד* *ki*, means *because*, is also true; but it must be translated as the sense of the narrative has respect to the thing intended, the thing done, and the time when. For instance, as to the cause, or thing intended, *Exod. xviii. 11; Deut. ii. 19;* it is here properly to be rendered by *BECAUSE*. 2dly. As it has respect to the effect, or thing done, *Psa. cxvi. 10, I believed, וְיָגֵד* *ki*; THEREFORE have I spoken, 1 Sam. ii. 25; here it cannot be translated by any word but *therefore*. But when *וְיָגֵד* *ki*, has relation to time, as in the passage before us, it is always to be rendered by *when*, *Exod. iii. 21; Jud. xvi. 16; Job i. 5.*

And lastly, if *וְיָגֵד* *gnad ki*, be taken together, as in this important passage, we shall find throughout the scriptures, where *וְיָגֵד* *ki*, follows *וְיָגֵד* *gnad*, and the thing spoken of has relation to time, it always means *until, till when*. Nor can it be understood in any other sense, than to signify a certain portion of time, in which the thing spoken of has a final termination or accomplishment. This is evident in *Gen. xxvi. 19, and the man waxed great, and went forward, and grew, וְיָגֵד* *gnad ki, UNTIL he become very great, 2 Sam. xxiii. 10, He rose and smote the Philistines, וְיָגֵד* *gnad ki, UNTIL his hand was weary.* Not that the man grew, FOR EVER, BECAUSE he became very great; or that Samson smote the Philistines FOR EVER, BECAUSE his hand was weary. From which it is obvious that the true sense of this passage, as understood by Christians, is perfectly consistent with the original.

Another application of this passage has been attempted by some Jews, who have been bold enough to declare, that it does not refer to any person in the character of a MESSIAH, or a DELIVERER. They say that the word *וְיָגֵד* *yabo*, i. e. he shall come, which is immediately connected with *וְיָגֵד* *Shiloh*, in the third proposition, refers to *וְיָגֵד* *Judah*, in the first proposition. In the last clause also, *וְיָגֵד* *ve lav*, and unto him, is said to refer to Judah. Certainly nothing can argue greater ignorance concerning the construction of the language, than to suppose, that the person of the verb in the third proposition, where it is joined with *SHILOH*, can refer to Judah in the first proposition, where it is cut off by both *Attach* and *Katon*, the major and minor proposition, from any such connection. And thus we are told by these writers, that this gathering of the people, was when the whole congregation of the people assembled at Shiloh, which was on the border of the land of Canaan, being the first place where the ark was established for the worship of God. And, therefore, that the place was called Shiloh, because, agreeably to the divine communication, they were informed that SHILOH, the DELIVERER, was to come and deliver them.

But it cannot be allowed, that this prophecy should be of no greater consequence than to inform the sons of Jacob, that in the time of the fourth descent from Jacob, a congregation of his descendants should assemble at a village called Shiloh,

in the path : that biteth the heels of the horse ; when he supplicated his dominion ended.

18 I have waited for thy salvation, JEHOVAH.

19 Gad, a company, he will assemble us : yea he will overcome finally.

Josh. xviii. 1, and that the *sceptre*, or staff of rule, should be in the tribe of Judah till that period, when it should depart. Surely if this were true, the *sceptre*, or staff of rule, should have been in the tribe of Judah during their stay in Egypt, and their journey for forty years in the wilderness ; and then it should have departed from Judah at the assembling at Shiloh. But the *sceptre*, or staff of rule, was not exercised by the tribe of Judah, during their abode in Egypt ; they were among themselves, as a nation governed by their own patriarchal priesthood, the priesthood of Joseph, 1 Chron. v. 1, for the term of one hundred and eighty years before they quitted Egypt. Nor was any such rule exercised by the tribe of Judah during their journey to Canaan, for they were governed by Moses, who was of the tribe of Levi, and afterwards by Joshua, who was of the tribe of Ephraim ; from which it is evident that the *sceptre* was not in the tribe of Judah, therefore could not depart from it. Consequently this notion, which some Jews have ventured to promulgate, is altogether without foundation ; and the following remarks on these original words will shew the ignorance of these writers respecting the true reading of the Hebrew.

The first, or minor proposition is, the *SCPTRE shall not depart from Judah* ; here ends the first proposition, where the sense is complete, as it refers to the *sceptre*, rod, or staff. The major proposition is, *as a LAWGIVER from between his feet* ; where the whole sense respecting the *sceptre* and the *lawgiver* finishes ; as is signified by the proper stop, *Atnah*, to introduce the person in the third proposition, at whose coming the *sceptre* and the *lawgiver* were to depart : viz. *until Shiloh come, and unto him (Shiloh) shall the gathering of the people be* ; not unto Judah shall the gathering of the people be.

11. *Binding his sole to the vine.* In this passage the patriarch was permitted to shew to his descendants, by the figure of a vine, and the fruit of the vine, the character of Shiloh, who was to establish the true church, by purifying the worship, and by putting an end to the forms, ceremonies, types, and figures, under the Mosaic dispensation.

By the vine, in scripture, is meant the church universally, Isa. v. 1, 7 ; Psa. lxxx. 8 ; Hos. x. 1 ; Jer. ii. 21 : but the tribe of Judah by the best vine, viz the vine of *Sorek*, and by the *blood of grapes*, the unadulterated produce of this vine of *Sorek*, the divine purifying power of Messiah.

In the translation it appears as if there were two animals mentioned, viz. the *foal*, and the *ass's colt*. But the word *beni*, when applied to man, means the male, and should be rendered here *the offspring*. Also the *v* *vau*, prefixed to *sorekah*, is evidently explanatory, as this vine is applied to the tribe of Judah, and should be rendered by *even*.

sorekah, has been rendered *choice vine* ; but the original is express. *Sorek* was a village where Delila resided, Jud. xvi. 4 ; so that the translators have mistaken a village for a *choice vine*, which gives us no information. This village was about a mile from the valley of Eschol, which, being translated, means *the valley of grapes*. It means a *colour*, and is applied to horses, Zech. i. 6 ; to *flax*, which in its raw state is of a yellowish cast, Isa. xix. 9. Hence it was used by the sacred writers to mean *the yellow vine*, it being also the most productive ; and by this, the tribe of Judah was symbolized ;

20 Concerning Asher, plentiful his bread : for he shall deliver the delights of a king.

21 Naphtali, sendeth forth strength : delivering acceptable promises.

22 Joseph, a fruitful branch ; a fruitful branch

Judah being the most numerous of all the tribes, Numb. xxvi. 22. And thus it was applied to the Messiah, in the *latter days*, whose followers for numbers were compared to the *dew of the morning*.

This word also means a *covering*, and, with a variation in the termination, is used for the *vail* with which Moses covered his face, Exod. xxxiv. 33, 34, 35. Therefore the *blood of grapes* is figuratively used, not to cleanse or wash his clothes ; but as this is produced by the divine order in nature, it is applied to the *vail*, the total cleansing or removal of the *vail* of external ceremonies and representative forms of worship, through that divine energy which was to be manifested by Messiah. To this great event the prophet alludes when he says, Mich. iv. 1, *But in the last days (the days of Messiah), iv. 3, He shall judge among many people, and rebuke strange nations afar off ; and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning hooks : nation shall not lift up a sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.*

12. *His eyes shall sparkle with wine.* This refers to the consecrated wine, which in all the ancient churches was used as a figure.

14. *Couching down between two burdens.* From this translation we receive no information ; we cannot possibly understand what can be meant by *an ass couching down between two burdens*. Before I speak of the true translation, it is necessary to shew the defect of the present one ; and in the first place, if *רבן* *robets*, could with any propriety here be translated *couching*, the word *down*, is not only unnecessary, but it is obviously improper ; for the word *couching* plainly means that it must be *downward*. This is another proof of the accuracy of the original. *עֲבֹדָתָם* *Ha mishphethaayim*, which they have taken to be plural, is translated *two burdens* ; and what is singular ; it is only rendered to mean a *burden* in this one passage in all the scripture. The very same word without the prefixes, which make no alteration in the meaning, is rendered in Psa. lxxviii. 13, *pots*, viz. *have lien among the pots*. But certainly the same word cannot mean in one place *pots*, and in another *burdens*. This word means a *sheepfold* : see where Issachar is spoken of, Jud. v. 16, he is represented as following the occupation of a shepherd folding his sheep, viz. *why abodest thou (עֲבֹדָתָם* *va been ha mishphelayim*,) among the sheepfolds, to hear the bleatings of the flocks ? Here the same word, both consonants and vowels, is rendered *sheepfolds*, confirmed by its connection with *עֲבֹדָתָם* *gnaduarim*, *flocks*, and introduced by the same prefixes as this in the verse under consideration. Now the patriarch was informing them what should take place in the *latter day* ; we have seen that this *latter day* could not refer to anything which took place in the tribe of Issachar, or in any of the other tribes before the dispersion of that people which is plain from the 10th verse, where we are told that the *sceptre* should not depart before the coming of Shiloh. I say, as the patriarch was informing them what should take place in this *latter day*, it is unquestionably evident, that this *latter day* was understood by him to be, the day of Messiah. For as all the prophecies in this memorable chapter primarily relate to Him, to whom the gathering of the people was to be ; so he is here, in the very important view which the patriarch had of him,

before a fountain: whose branches run over the wall.

represented in the official character of a shepherd folding his flock. And accordingly in this peaceful and useful occupation, he is represented by the prophets, *Psa. xxiii. 1, The Lord is my shepherd; Isa. xl. 11, He shall feed his flock like a shepherd.*

15. *And he saw that rest was good, &c.* Commentators have been at a loss how to understand this verse, and have given us interpretations which have no meaning, no application. They have told us that Issachar as a tribe would be content to "bear patiently the fatigues of agriculture, submitting to exorbitant taxes, rather than exert themselves to drive out the old inhabitants: that the two burdens literally mean *two panniers*, one on each side of the animal's body; and couching down between these, refers to the well-known propensity of the ass, when wearied or overloaded, to lie down with its burden on its back." O lamentable view of the sanctity of scripture! The question may be asked, where would have been the justice of "driving out the old inhabitants," dispossessing them of their property, and ruining their families, smiling and crying infants? No such driving out as this was ever expressed in the commands given to the Hebrew law-giver; nor was any thing of the kind ever done to the old inhabitants when the commands were executed either by him, or by his successor Joshua, as will be shewn in its proper place, when we come to the book of Deuteronomy. Neither is it true that this tribe submitted to *exorbitant taxes*, in any stage of the Theocracy, or of the monarchy, any more than the other tribes. Where are we to look for the sanctity of this most important part of scripture, if it could be any way said, that Issachar was compared to an ass lying down between two panniers? by submitting to exorbitant taxes? No such thing is signified in the original text.

In the common version we have no other view but that of the sensuality of this tribe, viz. *because they saw that the rest was good, and the land pleasant.* And this view has arisen from inattention to the proper choice of words, comprehending a similar meaning. Thus we find that the very first proposition is unnecessary, viz. *And he saw that rest was good*: no one can doubt this; we all know that rest is good at all times, and therefore there was no necessity to be told so.

I believe it will be allowed by all Christians, that in a figurative sense, the names of the twelve sons of Jacob, signified twelve states of perfection through which the Messiah was to pass when he redeemed his people. For it is remarkable, that the number *twelve* in scripture means that which is *complete and perfect*: *twelve tribes*; *twelve stones*; *twelve cakes* before the Lord; *twelve disciples*; *twelve baskets full*; when he was *TWELVE YEARS OLD*; a crown of *twelve stars*; and had *twelve gates*; the city had *twelve foundations*; *twelve pearls*; and *twelve*, multiplied *into itself*, is the complex of those who are said to be chosen, *Rev. xiv. 3*. It therefore being evident that this great personage is referred to, as we have seen in the 10th verse, that he was to accomplish the great work of redemption, and to lead his people finally to the *heavenly Canaan*, the *heavenly Jerusalem*, or *city of peace*; the verb *וַיַּרְא* *va yaree*, rendered, *And he saw*, should be rendered as it is, *Gen. vi. 12*; —*viii. 13*; *xviii. 2*, &c. and *he looked*. Also the word *מְנוּחָה* *menuchah*, which follows, and which is rendered, *that rest*; cannot be so translated, as the following word *כִּי* *ki*, is then unnoticed in the common version. The preposition *וּ* *mem*, therefore prefixed to this word, should also be translated as, with the same construction, it is in *Isa. xl. 17*;

23 But they grieved him, when they persecuted: for the masters of arrows, hated him.

Ezek. xlv. 20, for; viz. he looked for a rest that was good, even a land that was delightful.

The word *נָח* *lewas*, is rendered *to tribute*. The root of this word is frequently rendered *to melt*, or *dissolve*, *Exod. xvi. 21*; *Psa. lxxviii. 2*. This applies literally to the action of melting. It also means, *to waste*, or *consume*, to be discouraged by affliction of heart, *Dent. i. 28*; *Josh. v. 1*. And thus it is applied to *affliction*, which *melts*, or *dissolves* the heart, *Job ix. 23*; *Isa. xxxi. 8*, this is the primary meaning. Thus it is applicable to the Messiah, who hath prepared a rest for the people of God, *even a land that is delightful*; in order to obtain which, *he stretched forth his shoulder to carry*, i.e. *he hath carried our sorrows*, *Isa. liii. 4*; and *he became a servant of affliction*, *Isa. liiii. 9*, *he was afflicted*.

Thus it appears plain, that this prophecy concerning Issachar, cannot with any propriety have respect to him, or to his tribe; for he did not bow his shoulder to the burden, neither was he either a servant of affliction or of tribute, any more than the other tribes. But the patriarch declared that all this was to be most eminently fulfilled in the person of the Messiah, to whom he refers in the first verse; *I will tell you what our (Messiah) will declare to you in the latter days.*

16. *Dan shall judge, &c.* This is not intelligible: all the tribes judged their own people; therefore there is no preference given to the tribe of Dan in the original of the passage. The word *שִׁבְטֵהֶם* *shibtee*, rendered *tribe*, evidently means a ruler, for at this period the sons of Israel could not be called tribes. Agreeably to the order under that dispensation, the firstborn had a prior claim to the government, either in the church, or in the civil department: therefore the tribe of Dan, not Dan himself, had the privilege of succeeding to the priesthood if there were no firstborn among the descendants from Leah, or Rachel. Dan also, as the firstborn, gave the privilege to this tribe of exercising the office of supreme judge; on which account it is said, that *Dan should judge his people as one of the rulers of Israel.*

Here Dan represented the Messiah in the character of a judge, which is the meaning of the word *Dan*. See *Isa. xi. 1, 4*, *There shall come forth a rod from the stem of Jesse—with righteousness shall he judge the poor.*

17. *Dan shall be a serpent.* Commentators have not given us any information concerning this passage: they have said that the word *נָחָשׁ* *naachaash*, means a *serpent*, in conformity with the common version; but we are at a loss to know in what sense Dan was to be a serpent. Some have thought that by this figure of a serpent, the patriarch prefigured the tribe in general. This however does not appear to be the case: they have not considered in what light the serpent was used by the sacred writers. Agreeably to its natural propensities, we have found that it signifies the principle of *circumspection*, *prudence*, *contrivance*; see *ch. iii*. It was a phrase applied to judges, and not only applied to signify this principle in man, (qualities most eminently necessary in a judge;) but it also signified that principle in its highest perfection in the Messiah, *be ye wise as serpents*. Thus if we view Dan in the elevated character of a judge, it cannot be allowed that any thing of the evil qualities alluded to, can be charged on this tribe.

Now as every particular in this important prophecy has relation to the Messiah, and to his kingdom; so we find that there is a harmony in the meanings of the names of the twelve tribes as applicable to the Messiah. Reuben, behold a son;

24 But his bow continued in strength; for the arms of his power strengthened, by the

Simoon, he hearkened; Levi, the congregator; Judah, praise; Zebulun, the dwelling place; Issachar, the satisfier; Gad, the penetrator; Asher, the blesser; Naphthali, the wrestler; Joseph, the gatherer; Benjamin, the son of the right hand; Dan, the judge; even MESSIAH, who in the latter days is to judge his people.

No that the rider shall fall backward. It is not possible to form any rational conclusion concerning this passage in the common version; for it certainly does not follow, because a serpent may bite the heels of a horse, that his rider should fall backward. And admitting this was so, what useful information would be communicated by such a circumstance? A subject of so unimportant a nature, and not having any relation to things past or future, so as to enable us to make a rational application, could not be communicated by the sacred writer. I shall therefore give a translation agreeably to the grammar and phraseology of the Hebrew, and also according to the obvious sense of the narrative.

The word *וַיִּפֹּל* *vayofel*, is in the common version translated in the *future tense*, viz. *shall fall*; but this verb is in the *preter tense*, viz. *he fell*; see Gen. xlv. 14, where the same word is necessarily so translated, ch. xlv. 29;—1. 1; Numb. xiv. 5; and so in every part of scripture; consequently the common version is wrong, as it obviously refers to something past. It means to *fall*, to *fail*, to *fall down*, to *supplicate*. See on 1 Sam. xix. 24. The word *וַיִּרְכַּב* *roko*, translated *his rider*, has also various modes of expression, according to idiom. It is a mark of dominion and power, to *ride*, either literally, or to be invested with dominion; to go on prosperously, Hos. x. 11. *I will make Ephraim ride, Judah shall plough, and Jacob shall break his clods*; evidently referring to the priesthood of Jacob and Judah, by the figure of preparing the ground for the reception of seed. Jacob established the priesthood, who was followed by Joseph, and finally it was settled on Ephraim, preparing the way for the priesthood of Judah, in the person of the Messiah, signifying that he should *ride*, i.e. he prosperously. See also Psa. xlv. 4, *And in thy majesty ride prosperously*.

Again the Hebrews are said to have ridden on the high places of the earth. Deut. xxxii. 13, *He made him ride on the high places of the earth*. God is said to have caused men to ride over their heads, Psa. lx. 12, and xviii. 10. God is said to have ridden on a cloud: *he rode upon a cherub*, meaning the dominion of God in the heaven. Not that God literally rode upon a Cherub, but as the word *כֶּרֶב* *cherub* means, *like the Divine Majesty*; so by his supporting power the universal dominion of the Divine Majesty is here signified.

But on the earth, this word is applied to mean the government of God on earth under the Theocracy. His chariot was the Cherubim in the temple, 1 Chron. xxviii. 18, *The chariot of the Cherubim*. I therefore translate this word, in conformity with its obvious application, *by his dominion or rule*.

The word *וַיִּפֹּל* *achor*, is translated *backward*, viz. *the rider shall fall backward*. But every reader capable of forming an opinion, must necessarily see, that this translation can have neither meaning nor application. In other parts of scripture this word is rendered by *behind*, Psa. cxxxix. 5; *back*, 2 Sam. i. 23; *in the hinder parts*, ch. lxxv. 66; and *without*, Ezek. ii. 10. But its primary meaning throughout scripture, when applied to men, is *the posteriority, the last, the remnant*; and when applied to states, as in this passage, viz. the state of

power of the mighty one of Jacob; from thence is the Shepherd of the stone of Israel.

the church, or its final settlement in the line of Joseph, it means *the end*; see Dan. viii. 9; Eccles. x. 13; Deut. x. 12; Job xli. 12; and as the word is participial, I render it *ended*. The clause then reads in conformity with the grammar of the Hebrew, and the plain sense of the narrative, respecting the succession to the priesthood by Joseph, and the rejection of the son of Bilhah, whose dominion, rule, or government in the church ceased. It literally reads, *When he supplicated, his dominion ended*.

This clause refers to the abovementioned period, when there was no successor, that is, no firstborn son in the family of Jacob, to take the priesthood, except Reuben, who, as above, was cut off from the succession. Then it was that Dan, being the firstborn of Bilhah, was the only successor to the priesthood. He was by right invested with power to govern the church, and at this period there can be no doubt but that he officiated as a superior in that part of the land. This was the state of the succession for above twenty years to the birth of Joseph: the power and rule of Dan, who supplicated in the priestly office, then ceased; his dominion ended, and it passed over to Joseph, the legitimate successor.

At this period it was that Reuben took up the cause of Dan, the son of Bilhah, ch. xxxvi. 22, where he *remained with*, not *laid with*, Bilhah: and at that period it was, when Joseph brought the evil report to his father, viz. that Reuben, in conjunction with Dan, the son of Bilhah, meant to secure to themselves, and to establish the ancient order of the priesthood, that he invested him with the order, and put upon him the garment of supplication. See ch. xxxvii. 3.

18. *I have waited for thy salvation, O Lord*. This we are told by commentators, "is a remarkable ejaculation, and seems to stand unconnected with all that went before, and all that follows. Though it is probable that certain prophetic views, which Jacob now had, and which he does not explain, gave rise to it." But this certainly would not have been consistent with infinite Wisdom, to have opened to Jacob the scenes of futurity, unless these "prophetic views" were to have been communicated for the benefit of his people in all ages. "Both Jewish and Christian commentators have endeavoured to find out the connection in which these words existed in the mind of the patriarch," but nothing satisfactory has hitherto been discovered, so as to enable us to connect it with any thing past or future.

It will be recollected, that in the ancient churches before the Israelitish church, the successor to the priesthood was chosen from the firstborn; that on the defection of Reuben, who would otherwise have succeeded, no successor could have been chosen from the other children of Leah. And as Rachel had no children, the hopes of Jacob were, to all appearance, cut off from having the priesthood continued in his line, agreeably to the promise to Abraham, Isaac, and himself.

A long time had elapsed when Dan, the firstborn of Bilhah, put an end to all his fears, and again was Jacob in possession of a successor to the priestly office. Thus, agreeably to the history, we find that this tribe was eligible to give a ruler to Israel. Samson was a striking representative of the Messiah; he was of the tribe of Dan, a promised son by the divine communication—judged Israel—redeemed the nation from bondage—overthrew the great temple of idolatry—and died in the cause of God and his people. Therefore, in contemplating the state he was in with regard to a successor, a representative of the Messiah, in whom all the nations of the earth were to be

25 Even the God of thy father who will help thee, yea the ALMIGHTY who will bless thee, with blessings of heaven from above; blessings

of the deep, lying beneath: blessings of sustenance, and mercy.

26 The blessings of thy father have prevailed,

blessed, and having been informed by the intercourse from the Cherubim, of the particulars of the great salvation which was to be accomplished by Messiah in the latter days, he broke forth with this ejaculation on the conclusion of his blessing to Dan, *I have waited for thy salvation, O Lord.* He had not only seen Dan the firstborn, but also Joseph, who had a legitimate right to the succession of the priesthood, as the great representative of Messiah the king.

19. *Gad a troop shall overcome him.* It is obvious that this cannot be the true sense of the passage; there is no allusion in the original to Gad being overcome, nor to any thing he was to overcome.

The word יגועדו *yegoudenou*, is rendered *shall overcome him*; the verb is not applied in the oblique case of the third person singular, *him*, but in the oblique case of the first person plural, *us*; and the verb properly means to assemble, to gather together in troops; see Jer. v. 7; Psa. xciv. 21; Mich. v. 1. As a noun, an army, a band, to invade, Heb. iii. 16; but in no part of scripture does it mean to overcome; nor do we find in any part of the history of this tribe, that it overcame, or was overcome, any more than the other tribes, to sanction such a translation.

Now the obvious meaning of this passage is, that Jacob referred to the succession of the priesthood. Dan, as above, being the firstborn of Bilhah, stood in the line of the priesthood; he was born to Rachel, the younger sister; but Gad, the firstborn of Zilpah, who, though he was younger than Dan, was born to Leah, the eldest sister; and thus he had a prior right, according to the law of primogeniture. That this was the understanding of the sacred writer when recapitulating the prophecies delivered by the venerable patriarch, appears from what is said, Deut. xxxiii. 20, *Blessed is he that enlargeth Gad, he dwelleth as a lion, and teareth the arm with the crown of the head.*

This passage in Deuteronomy, when rightly translated, will enable us to illustrate the verse under consideration. We cannot form any conclusion concerning the meaning of the clause, *and teareth the arm with the crown of the head.* It represents the tribe of Gad as a barbarous, merciless race; and yet in the preceding clause it is said, *Blessed is he that enlargeth Gad.*

In this clause תארף *taaraph*, rendered *he teareth*, means *leaves a branch, a scion plucked off from the stock*, Gen. vii.; Ezek. xvii. 9, which here is applied to his being cut off from the priesthood as one of the firstborn.

זרעו *zerco*, rendered *arm*, is used to mean power, Psa. lxxix. 11, *thy power*, Deut. vii. 19; Exod. vi. 6, &c. &c.

קרפ *kaddad*, as is observed in another place, has no such meaning as *the crown of the head*; it means the submission of others to this tribe, as a superior firstborn, invested with power, either spiritual or temporal; see 1 Sam. xxiv. 8, *he stooped*, Gen. xxiv. 48, and *I bowed*, &c. &c. It is one word, which means an extraordinary degree of submission, which is also obtained by conquest, a superior, or chief, to whom obedience is paid.

The following verse, the 21st of Deuteronomy, shews evidently that Gad was considered by the sacred writer as possessing a superiority in the right of the firstborn; for he says, speaking of Gad, *because there, in a portion of the lawgiver was he sealed, and he came with the heads of the people, he executed the justice of the Lord, and his judgments with Israel.* That is, he was also to be prior to Dan, agreeably to the law of

primogeniture, in case of there being no successor in the line of Joseph. And it is singular that the inspired writer, in the recapitulation of the blessings of the patriarch, places Joseph the first, the legal firstborn, ver. 13, who was born the last of the legal firstborn sons; Gad the second, ver. 20, who was born after Dan; and Dan the last, who was born before either of them, because he was born to the younger sister Rachel, but Gad was born to the elder, to Leah.

With this understanding, we have then a consistent sense. And it is worthy of notice, that all the firstborn retained, under that dispensation, a decided superiority above the rest of the tribes, as to their eligibility to the government, both in church and state, in all the churches before the Levitical order was established.

20. *Out of Asher his bread shall be fat.* This verse, in the new translation, confirms the above reading; but in the common version, these words cannot be applied; for the whole verse is not applied to Asher, but to Gad: so that there does not appear, as it now stands, to have been any thing of the nature of a blessing, or of a prophecy given concerning Asher. We can have no idea what can be meant by the words, *out of Asher his bread shall be fat, and he shall yield royal dainties.* If this 20th verse in the original were to be connected with the preceding verse, as it is in the common version, it would evidently mean that Gad was to have *his bread out of Asher*, and notwithstanding he was to *yield royal dainties*; for the pronoun *he*, in the common version, refers to Gad. Besides, the words *royal dainties* are altogether inapplicable. If we were to understand, by the common version, that this means a profusion of delicate food for the royal table, it would be too contemptibly sensual to have a place in the sacred volume.

Here again the patriarch, as the great establisher of the true worship of God, and the founder of the Hebrew polity, was, in his commands to his posterity, providing for the succession to the priesthood, and for the establishment of regal government by the firstborn, agreeably to that dispensation. שמנה *Sheemenah*, is rendered *shall be fat*; but the words *shall be*, are not sanctioned by the Hebrew. This word, according to idiom, means plenteous, Isa. xxx. 23; fruitful, ch. xxviii. 1. The verse reads, *concerning Asher, plentiful his bread: and he shall deliver the delights of a king*, viz. those judgments which are the delight of a good and wise government, and by which Asher is said to be blessed, agreeably to the import of his name. I have translated מלך *melek*, by *king*, this being its true meaning throughout scripture, and not *royal*: a person may be royal, and not be a king.

21. *Naphtali is a hind let loose, he giveth goodly words.* This is altogether unintelligible as it stands in the common version, and commentators have passed it over in silence, not knowing what to make of the clause, *Naphtali is a hind let loose*; which imports a degree of something wild and ungovernable, untaught and rudely barbarous; like the 18th verse, it refers to nothing past or future in any part of the history. Bochart translates this verse, *Naphtali is a spreading oak, producing beautiful branches.* But אגאלה *ayaalah*, does not mean an oak in any part of scripture; it does not come from אל *alah*, but from עזל *ezal*, strength, might, power, Psa. lxxxviii. 4, אל *strength*; Ezek. xxxi. 11; and for this reason it is applied to God. To men in power, Exod. xv. 11; 2 Kings xxiv. 15; Job xli. 25; Psa. lxxxix. 6; Deut.

according to the blessings of my progenitors; for the desirable things of the ancient hills: ye

xxviii. 32. If it were of no more consequence than to signify an uncommon increase of population in this tribe, or to the fruitfulness of their soil, as some commentators have supposed, it would not be worthy of a place in the scriptures. Neither would it apply; as other tribes were more numerous, and the land of Naphtali was not more productive than the portions allotted to the other tribes.

אֶפְרַיִם *efraim* *shaapher*, is rendered, *goodly words*; but *shaapher*, is not adverbial; it literally means that which is *acceptable*, Dan. iv. 2; and should be rendered, *I thought it acceptable*, verses 12, 21; *fair*, ver. 27; *acceptable*, v. 1. And though the word *efraim* is rendered by *words* in many places, yet with a different accentual construction, as in this passage, we find it varies its mode of expression, or calls for a different word which must will be consistent with the meaning of the root. In all languages we see that the meaning of a word, which may be considered as a root in our language, is capable of being preserved in different modes of expression; as, *say, speak, pronounce, utter, tell, command, converse, name, bid, teach, declare, promise, &c.* such is the case in Hebrew. Thus we shall have a sense consistent with the history, if we render this word agreeably to its meaning here, as it is in other places of scripture, by *promise*; see 2 Kings viii. 19; 2 Chron. xxi. 7; Esth. iv. 7, *he promised*. And if we turn to ch. xxx. ver. 8, we shall find that Rachel had wrestled before God, that she might be placed on an equal footing with her sister, that she might entertain the hope of Messiah being in her line; therefore she wrestled before God by faith, on the ground of his *acceptable promise*, that Messiah should come to redeem man. Hence she called him Naphtali, the *wrestler*; which, agreeably to the prophetic declaration of the patriarch, was applied to the Messiah; who was to appear in the latter days. This view will be best explained by the sacred writer, who says, Deut. xxxiii. 23, *O Naphtali, satisfied with favour, and full with the blessing of the Lord*; for Naphtali, either as it respected the man, or the tribe, was not more *satisfied, or full of the favour of the Lord*, than the other sons, or tribes of Jacob. So that in the divine communication, which communication had been given to the patriarch in the way by which God had always made known his will, viz. from above the Cherubim in the Holy Place; it was evidently applied to Messiah the *wrestler*, who was to wrestle for the Israel of God, and who was to be full with the favour, or grace of the Lord; who was to *send forth strength by declaring his acceptable promises* to all who should believe in him. The passage reads, *Naphtali sendeth forth strength, delivering acceptable promises*. The apostle Matthew quotes this prophecy as fulfilled when the Redeemer first opened his mission to Zebulun and Naphtali, ch. iv. 13, 14, 15, 16.

22. *By a well*. The word *בְּעֵינַן* *gaain*, is rendered *well*, but it means a *fountain*; it is used for the *first cause, the original*. Hence the *fountain of Jacob* is a phrase so called, because the priesthood, by whom the divine communications were made known, received them from the fountain of truth at this period, the priesthood having passed to the line of Jacob. It is therefore applied to God, Deut. xxxiii. 28; but this verse is defective in the common version, for *בְּעֵינַן* *baadad*, is rendered *alone*; and here the proposition is made to end, which ends where the stop *katon* is on Jacob, and which shews that *fountain* and *Jacob* cannot be joined with *corn and wine*, as in the common version. Therefore *baadad* requires the same

shall remain with the chief Joseph; even with the superior Nazarite of his brethren.

rendering as in Exod. xii. 37, *beside, or before*. Thus it appears that the church of God was promised a rest in the land 200 years before it took place—a place of rest as typical of that rest which was to be purchased in the latter days by the Messiah, the Redeemer of his people.

23. *The archers have sorely grieved him, &c.* The vulgar version of this verse is of little importance, but the literal translation will give us information.

We have seen that Reuben, being the firstborn, had a right to succeed to the priesthood, and the cause of his rejection by the church: the following remarks will also shew that the cause was as has been stated.

The word *רָבוּעַ* *remaru*, is rendered *have sorely grieved him*: the Hebrew reads, *they grieved him*. *רָבוּעַ* *Robou*, is translated, *shot at him*; but the words *at him* are supplied. Had a proper word been chosen consistently with this meaning, there had been no necessity for addition. It means to *persecute, strife, contention*, Gen. xiii. 7;—xxvi. 20; Exod. xvii. 2; Deut. i. 12;—xix. 17. The clause reads, *But they grieved him when they persecuted*.

בְּנֵי חֲבִלִים *Bagnali chilsim*, is translated, *the archers*. But in such case one of the words is not noticed. The word *bagnali*, throughout the scriptures, means, *masters, lords*: see Num. xxi. 28; Isa. xvi. 8; Neh. vi. 18; Eccles. xii. 1. And the word *chilsim* literally means *arrows*. See where the same word occurs, 2 Kings, xiii. 15, 18; 2 Chron. xxvi. 15. These words then literally read, *the masters of arrows*.

Another error has been committed. The word *bagnali*, which is the last word but one in the second proposition, is made the first word in the first proposition, and rendered *archers*, but without any authority to a certainty, as observed.

Had the translators adverted to some of the customs of the idolaters of the land, to which the sons of Jacob were in some degree attached at this period, it would not only have confirmed the defection of Reuben, but it would have shewn satisfactorily, that they at this time preferred the ancient order without sacrifice, as not only having antiquity for its support; but it was more pleasing to them than the drudgery of slaying and offering the animals.

Arrows, we are informed in scripture, were used in casting lots by way of divination among the idolaters, Ezek. xxi. 21; Hence we have the true understanding of this passage. The sons of Jacob are here called, *the masters of arrows, viz. the arrow masters hated him*. They having approved of the customs of the idolaters in divining by these arrows, hated Joseph, not only on account of his father having confirmed the priesthood on him, but because of his communications which he related to them, as appears, ch. xxxvii. 20, *Come now, let us slay him—and we shall see what will become of his dreams*. Thus when no word is omitted, and a literal translation given, the whole of this obscure passage has a consistent sense.

24. *But his bow abode in strength*. This passage, as it now stands in the common version, cannot be understood; we know not any thing of the bow of Joseph abiding in strength: if it were literally so, it surely would not be worthy of being recorded in the sacred volume. I shall preserve the Hebrew syntax, as the true reading cannot be had without it.

I have rendered the word *קֶשֶׁתוֹ* *keethetho*, by *his bow*; having no authority here to render it agreeably to the interpretation given of it by the sacred writer, where he defines it, ch. ix. 13, to mean, *a witness of the covenant, viz. of the*

27 Benjamin, a wolf, shall raven; in the morning he will devour prey; and at night he will divide spoil.

28 All these are the twelve tribes of Israel: and

covenant promise of Messiah. It was a phrase well understood by this ancient people; so that, if we drop the phraseology of the *bow*, Jacob said to Joseph, *But the power of his covenant witness remained.* The following propositions in this verse will also explain the meaning of this bow.

And the arms of his hands were made strong. This is an absurd expression, arms are necessarily attached to hands. *יָדָאָה* *Yadaya*, rendered *his hands*, means here, *his power*: see Dan. xii. 7; Job i. 12; *the custody*, Esth. ii. 8; *the dominion*, 2 Chron. xxi. 8. And thus by a natural metaphor it means *the hand, as possessing power.* The second proposition then reads, *the arms of his power were strengthened*; it then follows, *by the power of the mighty one of Jacob.* The word God which is incorporated in the text is not in the original. So that it was not the shooting bow of Jacob, admitting he had been a bowman; but the phraseological representative bow of the everlasting covenant between God and man, the promise of God, ch. ix. 12 to 17, in which Joseph confided; and which covenant promise he believed was to be accomplished, as certainly as that the bow, by the irrevocable decree of God, was to be seen in the cloud for ever.

From thence is the shepherd the stone of Israel. There appears to be an error in this translation. There was no necessity for us to be told, that the mighty God of Jacob was both the shepherd and the stone of Israel. There is no division between *רֹמֶשֶׁת* *romesh*, shepherd, and *אֶבֶן* *eben*, stone; they are nouns in construction, and read thus, *shepherd of the stone of Israel.*

This expression deserves particular notice. The patriarch here calls to the mind of Joseph, who now succeeded him in the office of the priesthood, the circumstance of his visit to Beth-el, where he first received the divine communication, and where he took the stone and anointed it. Thus he informed him that at this early period he was under the divine direction, and that as a shepherd watches over his flock, so the shepherd of Israel had watched over him. Now as Jacob and Joseph were not of the Levitical order of the priesthood, but were chosen from the firstborn; so in like manner he intimates, that Messiah, the shepherd of the stone of Israel, the Lord of the sacrifices, was not to be of the Levitical order of the priesthood, but after the order of Melchizedek, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph, viz. *from thence is the shepherd of the stone of Israel.*

25. *Even by the God of thy father, who will help thee.* *בְּיָהוָה* *Ma el*, even by the God; but as there is no authority for the word *by*, I have translated it as it literally reads, *Even the God of thy father.*

The following word *וְיָגוּרָהּ* *ve yangureha*, is translated, *who will help thee.* The last clause of the preceding verse, and this first clause, then read intelligibly and consistently with the original thus: *From thence is the shepherd of the stone of Israel—even the God of thy father, who will help thee.*

And by the Almighty, who shall bless thee. A similar correction is necessary here. *יְהוָה* *Feeth shaddi*, is rendered, and by the Almighty; but there is not any authority for the word *by*; it reads as above, viz. *even the Almighty.*

Blessings of heaven. The blessings which are here meant, were the blessings of the representative priesthood of the Messiah, called the blessings of heaven, because they received the

thus when their father had spoken to them, then he blessed them; every one according to his blessing, he blessed them.

29 Moreover he charged them, for he said to

divine communication. And now having mentioned the circumstance of his introduction into the office of the priesthood, when he anointed the stone, after the divine communication at Beth-el; he refers to the blessing when he was met at Peniel, on his return from Padan-aram, having made good his claim to the priesthood before the judge, which he now confirmed on Joseph.

Blessings of the deep. To make known the deep and hidden things of heaven concerning the advent of the Messiah, hidden as in the deeps beneath; but by the divine communications, which now were to be communicated by Joseph, and in his line were to be made known to the church.

Blessings of the breasts and of the womb. The word *שְׂדֵי* *shaadi*, rendered by *of the breasts*, appears to be a strange perversion of the original. Commentators say, by way of interpretation, "a numerous offspring and an abundance of cattle;" but this blessing would have been no greater than was in the order of providence given to others. If this were meant to be applied to an increase of children, even as all commentators have understood it, then there was no necessity for the translation of the following word *רַחֲמָאֵם* *raacham*, the womb; for the blessings of the breasts and of the womb are made the same in the common version.

שְׂדֵי *Shaadi*, is translated *breasts*. It comes from one of the divine names, *יְהוָה* *shaddi*, rendered *the Almighty*, i.e. *the power forth of all blessings*; and so it means *a field*, as pouring forth sustenance. It occurs in this sense in Isa. lx. 16;—lxvi. 11. Thus in after time we are informed that the idolaters of Canaan aped the true church in the manner of their worship, but instead of offering to God, they offered to the powers of nature as the power forth; they had their idols of the hills and of the valleys, Deut. xxxii. 17. *They sacrificed לַשְׂדֵי* *la shedim*, to devils, i.e. to destroyers, (to the various pourings forth of nature) and not to God. The word *רַחֲמָאֵם* *raacham*, rendered *the womb*, is here applied to the mind, and means, the affections, pity, compassion; Jer. xxxi. 20;—xlii. 12; Hab. iii. 2.

26. *The blessings of thy father.* It does not appear in the common version how the blessings of Jacob prevailed above the blessings of his progenitors; for Abraham was the most highly favoured of these three primary patriarchs. He was particularly called from the Chaldean nation to establish the true worship of God in Canaan, was in a most eminent manner favoured with the divine communication, and dignified with the appellation of, *the friend of God*; therefore it cannot be said, that the blessings of Jacob had prevailed above the blessings of his progenitors.

The word *בְּגֹל* *gnal*, which is here rendered *above*, cannot be so translated in this clause, as is plain, if the construction be attended to; and which also appears from the history itself. It should be rendered as it is in Exod. vi. 26; Josh. xxii. 9, *according to*; it then reads consistently with the history, viz. *According to the blessings of my progenitors*; that is, consistently with the divine communications which were given to his progenitors, concerning the establishment of the priesthood in all its departments, in the line of Jacob by Joseph, which will appear from the following clause.

Unto the utmost bounds of the everlasting hills. In these words, as they thus stand in the common version, there is no possibility of obtaining any information; translators have left

them, I am to be gathered to my people; bury ye me with my fathers, in the sepulchre that is in the field of Ephron the Hittite.

them to the fanciful illustrations of commentators. Some say that the blessings which Jacob prayed for, were to "exceed the duration of the eternal mountains." In this case the word *eternal* should not have been introduced, for that which is eternal, cannot exceed in duration another thing which is eternal.

The places of public worship under the dispensation before the Christian, were built on hills; from a consideration, that as the adoration of God was the highest, the most elevated dictation of the soul; so those ancients were of opinion that external things should bear some correspondence to internal things, or to things of a heavenly nature; and therefore that places of divine worship ought to be built on hills. On these hills it was where the sacred Cherubim were placed in the Holy of Holies; hence continual reference is made to the hills where the sacrifices were offered, as types of his coming who was called the *desire of all nations*, the Messiah, *Psa. xcvi. 8, Let the hills be joyful*;—*1. 10, The cattle upon a thousand hills*, i.e. for sacrifice;—*lxviii. 15, The hill of God is as the hill of Bashan*; *Isa. lxxv. 7, blasphemed me upon the hills*, viz. by idolatry.

There is no authority in this verse for the words *utmost bounds*, by which *מגדל תענת* *gnad taenath*, have been translated. *Taenath* means that which is *desirable*, *Psa. x. 3*;—*xxi. 2*;—*cxii. 10*; *Prov. xi. 23*;—*xix. 22*;—*xxi. 5*; *Isa. xxvi. 8, the desire*.

The phrase *everlasting hills*, is indefinite; it is generally understood to refer to heavenly and eternal things; but we cannot conceive how the blessings of Jacob could have prevailed unto the bounds of the everlasting hills. The blessings of Jacob, or the blessings of any other mortal, could not reach to the bounds of the everlasting hills, or the hills of heaven; these blessings being only in the gift of him who created the everlasting hills. *עולם לעולם*, is in the common version rendered *everlasting*; but I shall frequently have occasion to observe, that this word cannot mean *everlasting*, when it is applied to subjects which, according to the nature of things, cannot be eternal. This word has three variations for application, which are still consistent with its radix: when applied to eternal things, it means that which is conformable to such an idea, *Psa. xc. 2, From everlasting to everlasting thou art God*; but when it is applied to time, to the things of this world, it comprehends an unlimited time, literally to the end of the state, or thing spoken of, *1 Sam. i. 21*;—*xxvii. 12, he shall be my servant for ever*; *Isa. lxiii. 9, 11, days of old*; *Psa. cxliii. 3, long dead*; *Prov. xxii. 28*; *Isa. xlv. 7*; *Jer. xviii. 15, ancient*. Now as it is evident that the patriarch was here speaking, as the first verse states, *of the things which were to befall them in the latter days*, this word should have been translated by the word *ancient*, viz. the *ancient hills*; the hills where the worship of God had been celebrated *anciently*, even from the time of the establishment of the dispensation under Noah. The passage then reads, agreeably to the original, thus: *even the desire of the ancient hills*, viz. the fulfilment of the ancient prophecies concerning the Messiah, who was the desire of all the true worshippers upon the *ancient hills*.

They shall be upon the head of Joseph. Thus all these blessings were to be upon the head of Joseph. But here commentators have stopped; they have not told us what these blessings really were: the priesthood of Joseph has been passed over in silence, nay, it has not been known that such a priesthood ex-

isted during their abode in Egypt; consequently no information has been communicated as to its true, singular, and astonishing representation of the Melchizedekian priesthood of the Messiah.

The priesthood having been now confirmed on Joseph, was to descend in his line; and their deliverance from Egypt was to be effected during its continuance, that it might correspond with the priesthood of the deliverer, Messiah, who was to deliver his people. Joseph therefore was a true figure of the Messiah; he was banished into Egypt; became the *desire* and admiration of all the nations, and saved them from famine and death. He was the preparer of the way of the Messiah, the desire of all the churches, who was to appear in the latter days. Therefore all those things which were to be manifested in the latter days, were to take their formal, or representative beginning, in the line of Joseph. That is, Joseph was now a priest after the order of the Melchizedekian priesthood, who were chosen from among the firstborn, contrary to the order of the Levitical priesthood. Thus he was a true figure of the *desire of the ancient hills*, the firstborn, who was to be a priest after the order of Melchizedek, even the Messiah.

And on the crown of the head. The error committed here is obvious; for if the blessings were to be on the head of Joseph, they must of necessity have been on the crown of his head. Such a repetition would be condemnable in any writer or speaker. Therefore we cannot expect to find it in the original of the sacred volume, which is given in the most perfect of all languages: in comparison of which, all productions in all other languages are barbarous, abounding with unnecessary words.

The first word of this last proposition is thus rendered, making eleven words, seven of which have no authority in the original; viz. *of the head of him that was*. In the very preceding words we saw, that the blessings were to be on the head of Joseph; consequently there was neither necessity nor propriety for it to be repeated. The words *וְעַל כִּתְּפוֹתָיו* *ve le knadkad*, are rendered in Job ii. 7, *the crown*. It means the highest, the superior, of whatever it is applied to, and should be so rendered in other parts of scripture.

The true meaning of the word *נזיר* *nezir*, is *Nazarite*, but there was no necessity to render it, that was separated. It means to separate, literally the *Nazarite*, *Jud. xiii. 5, 7*;—*xvi. 17*; *separated, set apart, devoted to sacred things, consecrated, or anointed*. *Numb. vi. 6, 7. נזיר נעצר, the consecration of his God is upon his head*. *Heb. Even to the superior Nazarite of his brethren*.

28. *All these are the twelve tribes of Israel*. There was no necessity to say, as the translators have said in the common version, that these were the twelve tribes, or the twelve families of Israel: this was already known and acknowledged; nothing so futile is to be found in the original; therefore the translation must be incorrect.

The word *שִׁבְטָם* *shibtee*, is translated *tribes*; but it properly means the *patriarchal sovereignty*, which always, after this period, existed in each tribe, and ought not to be translated *tribe*. The first place where it occurs, is in the 10th verse of this chapter, where *שִׁבְטָם* *shibtee*, is translated by *recepte*. *The sceptre shall not depart*; properly the ruler shall not depart from Judah: see *Isa. v. 4, the judge*; *Jud. xxi. 24, every man to his tribe*; but should be, *every man with his ruler*. In the 10th verse it means the ruler, for it is improper to say, as it is there said in the common version, that *Dan was to judge his*

with the field of Ephron, the Hittite, for a sepulchral possession.

31 There they buried Abraham, with Sarah his wife; there they buried Isaac, also with Rebekah his wife: and there I buried, Leah.

32 The purchase of the field, and the cave that was therein, was from the sons of Hith.

33 When Jacob had left off commanding his sons; then he gathered up his feet in the bed: thus he expired, and was gathered to his people.

CHAP. L.

THEN Joseph fell, on the face of his father, and wept over him, and kissed him.

2 Now Joseph commanded his servants the physicians, to embalm his father: so the physicians embalmed Israel.

3 When they had accomplished forty days for him; for so they fulfilled the days of those who were embalmed: then the Egyptians mourned for him, seventy days.

4 Before the days of his mourning had passed, then Joseph spake, to the house of Pharaoh, saying: If now I have found favour in your sight; speak ye I pray in the audience of Pharaoh, saying;

people as one of the tribes of Israel—Dan was to judge his people as one of the rulers of Israel. And thus it should be rendered in every part of scripture, where a reference is made to the government of the people. Therefore it was proper for the sacred writer to shew to posterity, that the patriarchal sovereignty was by the divine order established in each tribe; that they had now begun to take the form of a regular government. And when they increased so exceedingly, and became a numerous and congregated people, all settled in one part of the land, of different habits, customs, and of a different religion; they began to appear so formidable to the Egyptians, as to be considered dangerous to their own government; and this brought on their persecution and deliverance.

We draw near to the close of this important book, which finishes with the death of the great founder of the polity of the Hebrews: as the last book of the Pentateuch ends with the death of their highly favoured lawgiver. The book of Genesis is undoubtedly one of the most important books in the sacred volume; not only because it gives us the most satisfactory information concerning the wonderful origin of the universe, and the miraculous creation of man; not because it gives us a rational statement how it was that human nature, created in a state of perfection, became imperfect; not because we have in these pages of the most remote antiquity, an authentic account of the formation of primeval nations, but because it is rendered holy by the first gracious promise for the redemption of man.

Commentators have thought, that the prophecies in the 49th chapter only have reference to the establishment of the descendants of Israel; but in such case, where would be the sanctity of this divine book, if it related only to the sensual en-

5 My father caused me to swear, saying; Lo, I die; in my sepulchre which I have prepared for me in the land of Canaan; there thou shalt bury me: therefore now I pray thee, shall I ascend and bury my father, then I will return?

6 And Pharaoh said: Ascend and bury thy father, accordingly as he hath caused thee to swear.

7 Now Joseph ascended, to bury his father: likewise all the servants of Pharaoh, elders of his house, ascended with him; also all the elders of the land of Egypt.

8 Even all the house of Joseph; his brethren, with the house of his father: but their families, and their flocks, and their herds, they left in the land of Goshen.

9 There ascended with him, also chariots and horsemen: for the company was exceedingly honourable.

10 Then they came to the floor of Atad, which is beyond the Jordan; and they mourned there, with a great and very grievous lamentation: there be held a mourning for his father, seven days.

11 When the inhabitants of the land, the Canaanites, saw the mourning at the floor of Atad,

joyments of the posterity of the sons of Israel in the land of Canaan? These prophecies were well understood among the ancient Hebrews; but in the common version, as there is no possibility of understanding them, so there can be no satisfactory application; for commentators have not come to any rational conclusion as to their meaning. The reader will, however, in the new translation, not only have an answer to the objections on the ground of obscurity, but he will be convinced that the passages, like the whole of the divine oracles in the original, are intelligible and true. He will find that the things communicated to the patriarch, and what should always be remembered, were communicated to him at a prior period, when he was receiving the divine command in the appointed way from above the Cherubim; I say the reader will find that these prophecies have relation to the person, even to the actual manifestation of the divine person the MESSIAH, in all his sacred characters of SON, WONDERFUL, COUNSELLOR, POWER OF GOD THE FATHER OF ETERNITY, PRINCE OF PEACE, IMMANUEL, MEDIATOR, and REDEEMER OF MAN.

NOTES ON CHAP. L.

11. *Abel-mizraim. The mourning of Egypt.*

16. *And they sent messengers.* But they did not send messengers to Joseph; there is no authority in the original for the word *messengers*, neither is there any necessity for it. The reason why this word is put in the common version is, because it is again said, in the 18th verse, that his brethren came to him; so that the translators concluded, the first visit to Joseph must have been by *messengers*.

The word *נָתַן* *ya'tan*, does not here convey the precise idea of *sending*, but to *go*, to *issue forth*, with an intention to

then they said; This is a grievous mourning of the Egyptians: wherefore he called the name of it Abel-mizraim; which is beyond the passage of the Jordan.

12 Thus his sons did to him, accordingly as he commanded them.

13 So his sons carried him to the land of Canaan, and buried him, in the sepulchre of the field of Machpelah; which Abraham bought with the field, for a sepulchral possession, of Ephron the Hittite, before the front of Mamre;

14 Then Joseph returned to Egypt, he and his brethren; also all that ascended with him, to bury his father: after he had buried his father.

15 When the brethren of Joseph saw, that their father was dead; then they said, Perhaps Joseph will hate us; and will certainly return to us, all the evil which we did to him.

16 Then they went forth to Joseph, saying: Thy father commanded in the prospect of his death, saying;

17 Thus ye shall say to Joseph, Forgive now I pray thee, the trespass of thy brethren, even their sin, for they have done evil to thee; yea now we pray thee forgive the trespass of the

servants of the God of thy father: and Joseph wept when they spake to him.

18 Thus his brethren went, and fell before his face: and said; Behold us before thee for servants.

19 And Joseph said to them, Fear ye not: for I am in the place of God.

20 Though ye yourselves, devised evil against me: God regarded it for good, in order to prepare as at this day, for the support of a multitude of people.

21 Therefore now ye shall not fear; I will nourish you, and your families: so he comforted them, and conversed with them.

22 Thus Joseph dwelt in Egypt, he and the house of his father: and Joseph lived; a hundred and ten years.

23 For Joseph saw of Ephraim; children of the third generation: also the children of Machir, the son of Manasseh, were brought up before the knees of Joseph.

24 Then Joseph said to his brethren, I die: but God visiting will visit you, and cause you to ascend from this land; to the land which he swore to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob.

go to a certain place, Deut. xxiii. 9; 1 Chron. xxiv. 7; Prov. xxx. 27; Ezek. xxiv. 12, *went forth*.

In the first clause of the 18th verse, the same thing is repeated in the common version, though a different word is used in the original; for the word *וַיָּבֹאוּ* *va yeelkou*, is also rendered by *went*. But it is necessary to remark, that this word means the accomplishment of the thing, or their arrival before Joseph. See where the same word is thus translated, 2 Chron. xi. 14, *AND CAME to Judah, and to Jerusalem*.

The word *גַּם* *gam*, is improperly translated in the common version by *also*, as it introduces the manner of their coming before Joseph, and is adverbial; it should have been rendered by the conjunction *thus*; and the *vau* prefixed to *וַיָּבֹאוּ* *yeelkou*, being adverbial also, should have been rendered by *moreover*, as in other parts of scripture. The first proposition shows how they conducted themselves when they came before Joseph; and without supposing that for which there is no authority, viz. that they sent messengers to him, it truly reads, *Moreover thus his brethren came and fell before his face*.

20. *But God meant it unto good*. There is no authority in the original for the word *but*: the language of this clause also in the common version is incorrect, viz. *meant it unto good*. This is not as any person knowing the use of words would express his meaning; to mean a thing unto a thing, is certainly not sense, though custom has made such phrases familiar.

חַשְׁבָּהוּ *Chashaabah*, rendered *meant*, has various applications, viz. to consider, reflect on, Ps. xl. 17; to regard, value, 1 Kings x. 21; to account, or esteem—xxx. 24;—xxxiii. 10;—xli. 27.

Much people. *רַב עַם* *Gnam raab*, is rendered *much people*;

raab, connected with *gnam*, cannot be understood here as an adjective or an adverb, but as a substantive. It means a multitude, in conformity with *gnam*, i. e. *people*, a noun-singular-of multitude.

To bring to pass as at this day. *וַיַּבְרֵךְ לֵב עֲבָדָיו* *Le magnan gneeah*, literally means *in order to prepare, not to bring to pass*, as in the common version.

To save much people alive. The word *save* appears evidently to be expletive; if they were saved from perishing, they must be alive; there is no authority for this word in the original. *וַיַּחְיֶה* *Le hachaieth*, is translated *to save alive*; this word, with this construction, has the same meaning as it has in Isa. vii. 21, *to nourish, to support*. The *he* emphatic, after *the* *h* *lamed*, will also then be noticed, viz. *for the support*.

23. *Were brought up upon Joseph's knees*. This is a Hebrewism, but it is very awkwardly translated, as it appears that Joseph nursed the children of his grandson. *בְּרַגְלָיו* *Gnal*, is translated *upon*, and thus we have in the version the words *up upon*. It should be rendered as in other parts of scripture by *before*, viz. *before the knees of Joseph*.

This short remark of the sacred writer informs us, that the children of the grandson of Joseph were brought up by him. So we learn that he lived to see the death of his grandson.

24. *God will surely visit you*. When we keep in mind, that Joseph had at this period been eighty years in the exercise of the duties of his office as high priest in Egypt, where he received the divine communication in the holy place, it will not appear singular that he should declare in so positive a manner to his brethren, how God would fulfil his promise to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, concerning the coming of the Messiah. For

25 Thus Joseph swore the children of Israel, saying: Visiting God will visit you; and you shall carry up my bones from hence.

It was this reliance on the promise of God, viz. *In thy posterity shall all the nations of the earth be blessed*, which enabled him to declare, that God would visit them, and that they should return to their own land, in the fourth generation, agreeably to the promise made to Abraham; and thus to prepare the way for the fulfilment of the promise in Eden by the manifestation of the MESSIAH. Heb. *God visiting will visit you*.

Thus we come to the establishment of the succession of the priesthood in the line of Isaac, agreeably to the holy covenant made with Abraham, viz. that *in him all the nations of the earth were to be blessed*. But from what has been said in the preceding pages, the reader will see that the nations of the earth were not blessed in Isaac, nor in his descendants the Jews, down to the time of their ceasing to be a nation. If it be said that the scriptures were calculated to enforce peace on earth, and goodwill towards men, still it cannot be said that the nations of the earth were blessed by the posterity of Isaac on this account. On the contrary, all the nations around them, not to mention all the nations of the earth, were gross idolaters; the religion of the Hebrews, their laws, statutes, judgments, rites, ordinances, ceremonies, sacrifices, and oblations, were principally confined to themselves. Therefore this sacred promise was not accomplished either during the Theocracy, or the monarchy to the time of the captivity, nor from that period to their final overthrow; but it remained to be fulfilled when the doctrines of the true Messiah, teaching love to God and charity to man, were to be promulgated throughout the world by the manifestation of this divine person, who, according to the positive declarations of the prophets, was to be born in Bethlehem, Mich. v. 2; during the continuance of the second temple, Hag. ii. 9. But where is BETHLEHEM NOW? Bethlehem is no more, nor can any one tell us where ancient Bethlehem stood.

26. In a coffin. קבר *ka kavar*, is, agreeably to our acceptation of the word, properly translated by *coffin*, *chest*, or *hollow receptacle*, into which the body of Joseph was put after embalming, according to the custom of the kings and nobles of Egypt. The sacred history is silent as to the place where his body was kept for the very long period, viz. three generations, before they were delivered from Egypt. That this coffin was kept in a place which was built for the reception of the dead among the Hebrews, there can be no doubt, as they were directed to take his bones with them, when they should depart to the land of Canaan. Consequently it must have been put in a place to which they could have constant access. It also follows, that as they were a people of different manners and customs, and lived as a distinct nation in the land of Goshen, the places for the reception of their dead must have been in that quarter.

After a lapse of 3600 years from the time of the building of these astonishing monuments, recent discoveries have laid before the world such important information, as not only confirms the truth of scripture history, but also determines the origin and ancient use of those stupendous and most ancient buildings, the pyramids of Egypt; concerning which, no writer, ancient or modern, has so satisfactorily developed their antiquity or use, as our learned countryman Dr. Edward Daniel Clarke, who, when the British army conquered Egypt and drove out the French, penetrated into the interior of the great Pyramid. But as the vestiges of the most remote historic antiquity do not reach to the time of the Hebrew legislator, this judicious

26 Then Joseph died; an hundred ten, years old: so they embalmed him; and he was put in a coffin, in Egypt.

writer was led to compare the discovery he had made, with the circumstances recorded in the ancient pages of the Bible, concerning the burial and preservation of the bones of Joseph; and the result appears to be, a discovery of the stone coffin in which Joseph was deposited, and which remains to this day in the great pyramid. Therefore as every thing calculated to elucidate scripture history, is of the first importance to mankind, the reader will be gratified by perusing the following extract from the third volume of the Doctor's Travels:

"As we drew near the base of the principal pyramid, the effect of its prodigious magnitude, and the amazement caused in viewing the enormous masses used in its construction, affected every one of us: but it was an impression of awe and fear rather than of pleasure. We had heard the pyramids described as huge objects which gave no satisfaction to the spectator, on account of their barbarous shape, and formal appearance; yet to us it appeared hardly possible, that persons susceptible of any feeling of sublimity could behold them unmoved. With what amazement did we survey the vast surface that was presented to us when we arrived at this stupendous monument, which seemed to reach the clouds! Here and there appeared some Arab guides upon the immense masses about us, like so many pygmies, waiting to show the way up to the summit. . . .

"The mode of ascent has been frequently described; and yet, from the questions that are often proposed to travellers, it does not appear to be generally understood. The reader may imagine himself to be upon a staircase, every step of which, to a man of middle stature, is nearly breast high; and the breadth of each step is equal to its height: consequently the footing is secure. Where the stones are decayed, caution may be required; but upon the whole the means of ascent are such that almost every one may accomplish it. . . .

"At length we reached the topmost tier, to the great delight and satisfaction of all the party. Here we found a platform thirty-two feet square, consisting of nine large stones, though much inferior in size to some used in the construction of this pyramid. . . .

"The view from this eminence amply fulfilled our expectations: nor do the accounts which have been given of it, as it appears at this season of the year (August 23d), exaggerate the novelty and grandeur of the sight. All the region towards Cairo and the Delta resembled a sea, covered with innumerable islands. Forests of palm-trees were seen standing in the water; the inundation spreading over the land where they stood, so as to give them an appearance of growing in the flood. To the north, nothing could be discerned but a watery surface thus diversified by plantations and by villages. To the south, we saw the pyramids of Saccára; and, upon the east of these, smaller monuments of the same kind, nearer to the Nile. An appearance of ruins might indeed be traced the whole way from the pyramids of Djiza to those of Saccára; as if they had been once connected, so as to constitute one vast cemetery. . . .

"..... Having collected our party upon a sort of platform before the entrance of the passage leading to the interior, and lighted a number of tapers, we all descended into its dark mouth. The impression made upon every one of us, in viewing the entrance, was this; that no set of men whatever could have thus opened a passage, by uncovering precisely the part of the pyramid where the entrance was concealed, unless they

had been previously acquainted with its situation; and for these reasons: first, because its position is almost in the centre of one of its planes, instead of being at the base. Secondly, that not a trace appears of those dilapidations which must have been the result of any random search for a passage to the interior; such as now distinguish the labours of the French upon the smaller pyramid, which they attempted to open. The persons who undertook the work, actually opened the pyramid in the only point, over all its vast surface, where, from the appearance of the stones inclined to each other above the mouth of the passage, any admission to the interior seems to have been originally intended. . . . Strabo describes not only the exact position of the mouth of the pyramid, but even the nature of the passage leading to the *Soros*, or *Soros*, in such a manner, that it is impossible to obtain, in fewer words, a more accurate description. (lib. xvii. p. 1143, ed. Oxon.) It seems also true; that this opening had been made before the time of Herodotus, although his testimony be less decisive. He speaks only of subterraneous chambers (*Enterpe*, c. 121); but it were impossible to know any thing of their existence, unless the pyramid had first been entered. Hence it is evident that a passage to the interior had been open from the earliest times in which any account was given of this pyramid; and perhaps it never was so completely closed, but that with a little difficulty an access might be effected. . . .

"We examined the chamber at the end of this passage, mentioned by all who have described the interior of this building. Its roof is angular; that is to say, it is formed by the inclination of large masses of stone leaning towards each other. Quitting the passage altogether, we climbed the slippery and difficult ascent which leads to the principal chamber. The workmanship, from its perfection, and its immense proportions, is truly astonishing. All about the spectator, as he proceeds, is full of majesty, and mystery, and wonder. . . . Presently we entered that 'glorious room,' as it is justly called by Greaves, where, 'as within some consecrated oratory, Art may seem to have contended with Nature.' It stands 'in the very heart and centre of the pyramid, equidistant from all its sides, and almost in the midst between the basis and the top.' The floor, the sides and roof are composed of that most beautiful variety of granite which Linnæus distinguished by the epithet of *durus rubescens*, called by the Italians *granito rosso*, composed essentially of feldspar, quartz, and mica. . . . It differs in no respect from European granite, except that the red feldspar enters more largely as a constituent into the mass than is usual in the granite of Europe. So exquisitely are the masses of this granite fitted to each other upon the sides of this chamber, that, having no cement between them, it is impossible to force the blade of a knife between the joints. We tried the experiment. There are only six ranges of stone from the floor to the roof, which is twenty feet high; and the length of the chamber is about twelve yards. It is about six yards wide. The roof or ceiling consists only of nine pieces, of stupendous size and length, traversing the room from side to side, and lying like enormous beams across the top.

"Near the western side stands the *Soros*, of the same kind of granite as that which is used for the walls of the chamber, and as exquisitely polished. It is distinguished by no difference of form or dimensions from the common appearance of the *Soros*, as it is often seen in Turkish towns when employed by the inhabitants to supply the place of a cistern. It resembles, as Greaves has remarked, 'two cubes finely set together, and hollowed within; being cut smooth and plain,' without sculpture or engraving of any kind. Its length on the outside is

7 feet 3½ inches; its depth 3 feet 3¼ inches; and it is the same in breadth. Its position is north and south. . . .

"The body of Joseph being thus placed in the *Soros*, and buried according to the accustomed usage of the Egyptians (as manifested by the existence of one of their ancient sepulchres containing the receptacle in question), was not intended to remain in Egypt. The Israelites had bound themselves by an oath, that when they left the land they would 'carry his bones' with them, Gen. i. 25. Accordingly, we find, that when a century and a half had elapsed from the time of his burial, the sepulchre, which during all this period had preserved his reliques in a *Soros*, was opened by the children of Israel. Their number amounted to 600,000 men when they went out of Egypt, besides the mixed multitude by whom they were accompanied, Exod. xii. 37, 38; a sufficient army, surely, even for the opening of a pyramid if it were necessary, especially when the persons employed for the undertaking were acquainted with the secret of its entrance; having from the very moment of the patriarch's interment, been under a solemn engagement to remove the body which they had there placed. However this may be determined, it is certain the tomb was opened; for no sooner is their departure mentioned, than we read, Exod. xiii. 19, 'Moses took the bones of Joseph with him.' Here, then, we have a record in history, which implies the violation of a sepulchre, and the actual removal of an embalmed body from the *Soros* in which it is said to have been deposited. The locality, too, of this sepulchre seems to coincide with that of the particular cemetery where this pyramid has for so many ages unaccountably borne the marks of a similar violation; its secret entrance being disclosed to view; and its *Soros* always empty. It is by no means here presumed that this circumstance will account for its violated state; but it furnishes a curious coincidence between the present appearance of the pyramid, and a fact recorded in ancient history which may possibly be urged to that effect. No other pyramid has been thus opened; neither is it probable that any such violation of a sepulchre would ever have been formerly tolerated: so sacrilegious was the attempt held to be among all the nations of antiquity, Egyptians, Jews, Greeks, and Romans. . . .

"Perhaps, with due attention to facts collected from ancient and modern writers, the whole connection might be traced between the history of Joseph, and the Egyptian mythology founded thereon. For this purpose the reader may be referred to all that Vossius has written upon the subject (vid. lib. i. cap. 29, tom. i. p. 213, de *Theologia Gentili*, Arist. 1642), who considers the Egyptian Apis as a symbol of the Patriarch. He supports his opinion by authority from Rufinus (*Historia Ecclesiastica*, lib. ii. c. 33); and derives evidence from Augustin, (*Script. Mirab.* l. i. c. 15), to prove that the Egyptians placed an ox near the sepulchre of Joseph. It appears also from Suidas (voce *Σάραψις*), that Apis was by some considered a symbol of JOSEPH: 'Quo ut magis inclinem facit,' observes Vossius, 'quod Josephus Deut. cap. penult. commate 17, hoc vocatur, secundum cosices Hebræos.' But if APIS were the same as JOSEPH, so must also be SERAPIS (or SARAPIS, as it is written by the Greeks) and OSIRIS; for these are but different names of the same mythological personage. 'Factus est Joseph quasi rex totius Egypti, et vocaverunt eum Apis,' says Kircher (*Edip. Egypt.* tom. i. p. 106, Rom. 1652); and he gives us from Varro the reason why he was called SERAPIS: 'Quia Arca (inquit Parr.) in qua positus erat, Græcè cum Aegyptiè dicitur Σάραψις, unde Σάραψις, quasi Arca Apis, deinde, undè literâ autolat, Σάραψις dictus est.' Also according to Strabo,

APIS was the same as Osiris. 'Ος ἰσὶς (Αἰς) ὁ αὐτὸς καὶ Ὀρίσις (lib. viii. p. 114, Ed. Oxon.) Hence it may be inferred that as JOSEPH, together with the names of APIS and SERAPIS, also bore that of OSIRIS, the annual mournings which took place in Egypt for the loss of Osiris's body, and the exhibition of an empty *Soros* upon those occasions, were ceremonies derived from the loss of Joseph's body, which had been carried away by the Hebrews when they left the country. Julius Firmicus, who flourished under the two sons of Constantine, endeavours to explain the reason (*De Error. Profan. Relig.*) why JOSEPH was called SERAPIS. In opposition to the origin assigned by Varro, for the name SERAPIS, it may be observed, that Plutarch (*De Isid. et Osir.* c. 29) derives a notion which prevailed, maintaining that SERAPIS was no god, but a mere name for the sepulchral chest where the body of Apis was deposited: Οὐκ ἄρα θεὸν τὸν Σέραπιν, ἀλλὰ τὴν Αἰπίδαο ΣΟΡΟΝ οὐρὸν νομαζέσθαι. But things which were rejected by the Greeks as inconsistent with their religious opinions, may come much nearer, on this account, to truth and to our own. A very popular opinion has long been entertained, concerning an extraneous idol brought to Alexandria, by one of the Ptolemies, from the coast of Pontus, which received the appellation of Serapis upon its arrival in Egypt; but the word Serapis is purely Egyptian. . . . and Jablonski has refuted the opinion, by proving that Serapis was worshipped in Memphis long before the time of the Ptolemies, (*Panth. Egypt.* lib. ii. c. 5, p. 233, Frank. 1750) and by showing from Eustathius that the whole story of this Sinopic deity was derived from Sinopium near Memphis. Thus Tacitus, 'sedem ex qua transierit (Serapis) Memphis perhibent, inclytam olim, et veteris Egypti columnam.' Yet Gibbon seems to imply (*Hist.* c. 28, vol. v. p. 90, Lond. 1807) that both the name and the idol were alike strangers to the priests of Egypt; and he sneers at the notion of Vossius, that the patriarch Joseph had been adored in the country as the bull Apis, and the god Serapis. (*Ibid.* see note 36.) The reader may consult the learned observations of Bochart upon this subject (*Hierozoicon*, tom. i. l. ii. c. 34, pp. 345, 346, 347, 348), and also of Jablonski, upon which Gibbon may have grounded his scepticism, although he has not mentioned his authors. The following passage of Apollodorus, as cited by Bochart, proves the name Serapis to be of ancient date in Egypt: 'Apis, relatus inter Deos, SERAPIS appellatus est.' Upon the identity of Serapis and Joseph many learned writers are agreed. 'Sunt qui APIM et SERAPIDEM unum nomen putarint, et per Serapidem JOSEPHUM intellerint; NEC VERITATI CONTRARIA VIDETUR HÆC OPINIO.' (*Cincens de Repub. Heb. Annot. Nicolai*, c. 17. not. 14. *Thes. Antiq. Sac. Ugolini*, Venet. 1745.) Indeed the number of authors and commentators by whom this opinion is maintained may be considered as more than a counterpoise to the objections of Bochart and of Jablonski. Tirinus (*Annot. in Sulpit. Sever.* p. 59, Ed. Horn. L. Bat. 1654) in addition to the authorities above cited, mentions also Pierius and Baronius: and he further

observes, 'Idque patet, Nam ex nomine Serapis quod Boveum notat; tum ex nomine Anaph, quo, teste Plutarcho, Osiris vocabatur, levi connotatione ex Joseph facta: tum ex Hieroglyphicis, quibus Osiridem designabant, puta figura bovis sequi vituli notis Luna et Solis insigniti: item juvenis imberbis cum modio et calathio in capite. Quæ in Josephum, ejusque boves et spicas, et ætatem, et astrologie peritiam, et amissim, quadrant. Subscribitur Clemens Alexandrinus, Augustinus, A. Lapide, et Bonfrerius.' See also *Spencer de Leg. Heb.* lib. iii. pp. 270, 271. Beyer, *Hen. V. Vegharst. de vero Dei Cultu*, p. m. 25. edit. Kilon. 1671. Michael. Not. ad Caffarell. *Curiositates*, edit. Hamburg, &c. &c."

Thus the inspired penmen finished the sacred book *מִתְחִלָּה*, i.e. in the beginning; by the Septuagint properly called ΓΕΝΕΣΙΣ, signifying the origin of the visible creation. This book, which is the most ancient book in the world, is also the most important book in the sacred volume; as it is an epitome of the Law, the Prophets, and the Gospel. Here are contained the particulars of the departure of our first parents from that superlatively happy state in which they were placed when they came from the hand of the Creator—the origin of evil, by their lamentable fall—and the manifestation of divine mercy, by the gracious promise of the SERPENT BRUIER—THE SHILOH OF JACOB—THE LORD OF DAVID—THE REDEEMER OF ISRAEL—and THE SAVIOUR OF MEN.

What a vast multiplicity of important objects present themselves in these divine pages! The origin of sacrifice, as representative of the coming of the Messiah—the increase of man—the establishment of nations—the deluge—the divine providence, manifested in the call of Abraham, to establish the worship of God in the land of Canaan—the fulfilment of the promise concerning Isaac, in whose posterity all the nations of the earth were to be blessed by the coming of Messiah—the establishment of the Melchizedekian priesthood in Jacob, and its final descent in the line of Joseph, to the time of the Levitical priesthood at the going forth from Egypt.

If the inquiring reader traces the footsteps of the Divine Providence in the most interesting of all narratives, the history of Joseph—the successor to the priesthood—taken from his country—sold into Egypt—cast into prison—brought before Pharaoh—and made the greatest subject in the kingdom—he will be satisfied that all this was done to establish the purpose of God, agreeably to the declaration to Abraham, even the accomplishment of the ancient promise for the appearance of the Messiah, who was to be a priest after the order of Melchizedek. This inquiry will lead the sincere and rational believer in the truths of the divine record, to a dignified view of the Omnipotent in the dispensations of his providence. He will learn by turning over the pages of his own experience, that he who planted the eye must necessarily see, and that his omnipresence and omnipotence are continually exerted to support the work of his hands.

DIVISION OF THE BOOKS OF MOSES ACCORDING TO THE ORDER AS READ BY THE JEWS.

THE five books of Moses are divided by the Jews into fifty-four sections, which are read in the Synagogue in the course of the year, one being read on each Sabbath: they put two of the shortest of them together, and read these two twice; so that the whole is finished in fifty-two sabbaths. In their intercalated years are fifty-four sabbaths: these two short sec-

tions then are read for each sabbath. Thus the whole Pentateuch was divided into fifty-four sections to harmonize with the necessity of the intercalated years. From all which it appears evident, that the Hebrews were as perfect in the science of astronomy as the Europeans at this day; and that they could with the greatest accuracy make the necessary intercalations

for the regulation of the year; otherwise the feast of the month Abib, which was commanded to be kept on the fourteenth day, would in time have passed through all the seasons of the year.

The reading of the Law and the Prophets is much the same now as it was in ancient time. Several references are made in the New Testament to this order of reading the Law and the Prophets. Acts xv. 21: *For Moses of old time hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every sabbath day.* Ch. xiii. 15: *And after the reading of the law and the prophets, the rulers of the synagogue sent unto them, saying.* We also find that our Lord himself read on the sabbath day, Luke iv. 16, *Going into the synagogue to read on the sabbath day, as was his custom, there was delivered unto*

him the book of the prophet Isaiah. The division that he read on that sabbath was, the sixty-first chapter of Isaiah. The Spirit of Jehovah God is upon me, because Jehovah hath anointed me to preach good tidings to the meek: he hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison doors for the prisoners, &c.

The book of Genesis is divided into twelve sections, and these sections are called by their respective names, which begin every division. In the Hebrew Bibles they are signified by the three Hebrew letters נח which are called *Parashoth*, i.e. divisions. But instead of the *Parashoth*, some are marked with the three סם *samechs*, for the word סדר *seder*, particular order, that which is complete.

- The First *Peresh*, begins, Gen. i. 1. and ends, ch. vi. 8. It is called כרשיח *Bereeshith. In the beginning.*
 The Second begins, ch. vi. 9, and finishes with chap. v. נח *Noah, i.e. Rest.*
 The Third begins at ch. xii. and ends at chap. xviii. לך לך *Lek leka. Go, depart.*
 The Fourth begins at ch. xviii. and ends at ch. xxi. ויאר *Va yeera. And he appeared.*
 The Fifth begins at ch. xxi. and ends with ch. xxv. 18. וחי סרה *Choyee Saarah. The life of Saarah.*
 The Sixth begins at ch. xxv. 19, and ends with ch. xxviii. 9. תולדות *Toldoth. Generations.*
 The Seventh begins at ch. xxviii. 10, and ends ch. xxxii. 3. וינס *Va yeetsee. And he went forth.*
 The Eighth begins at ch. xxxii. 4, and ends with ch. xxxvi. וישלח *Vayishlach. And he sent.*
 The Ninth begins at ch. xxxvii. and ends with ch. xl. וישב *Vayeesheb. And he dwelt.*
 The Tenth begins at ch. xli. and ends with ch. xlv. 17. סק *Mikeets. At the end.*
 The Eleventh begins at ch. xlv. 18, and ends ch. xlvii. 27. ויגש *Vayigash. And he approached.*
 The Twelfth begins at ch. xlvii. 28, and ends with ch. l. ויחי *Vayechi. And he lived.*